LIBRARY
2492
Pacific Theological Seminary.

ALCOVE, SHELF,

Presented by
Enoch Pond & Son

E. Pond

A

# DISCOURSE

ON

# Human Ability and Inability.

---

BY

Rev. BENNET TYLER, D. D.,

PRESIDENT AND PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN THE THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF CONNECTICUT.

---

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

Hartford:

PRESS OF CASE, TIFFANY AND COMPANY.

M.DCCC.LIV.

# PREFACE.

THE views presented in the following discourse, are believed to be substantially the views which have been maintained by New England Calvinists generally, since the days of President Edwards. They were set forth in his treatise on the Will, were ably vindicated by his son, Dr. Jonathan Edwards, in his treatise on Liberty and Necessity, and were very clearly and fully discussed by Dr. Smalley, in two discourses entitled "*The inability of the sinner to comply with the gospel, his inexcusable guilt in not complying with it, and the consistency of these with each other, illustrated.*" They have been brought into view, more or less distinctly, by most of the New England theological writers.

Dr. Woods, in his lectures on "The inability of sinners to obey the divine commands," does not make use of the terms *natural* ability and inability, but he says, "In my treatment of this subject, I shall have the pleasure of going in company with such men as Edwards, Dwight, Smalley, Fuller, Day, and other well known defenders of sound theology." He explains very clearly the kind of inability under which sinners labor, and shows, that it is nothing but a moral inability, which consists in a wicked heart, or perverse inclination; and in answer to the questions, "Is there not a sense in which sinners *can* do what God requires? have they not *some kind* of ability?" he says, "Yes, they have some kind of *ability;* they are not, in every sense, unable to obey. They have no such inability as excuses or palliates the guilt of disobedience." It is plain, therefore, that he did not hold that God requires of men what they have *no* power to do. "They have some kind of ability. They are not, in every sense, *unable* to obey." This is precisely the doctrine maintained in the following discourse, and the doctrine which was maintained by Smalley when he said, "There are two very different kinds of inability."

Whether the terms *natural* and *moral* are the best terms to designate these different kinds of inability, is a question of comparatively little consequence; but that the distinction should, in some way, be clearly made, appears to me to be of great importance. And this brings to my mind a remark of the late Dr. Nettleton. He said, "I can not preach the gospel without making this distinction, although I do not conceive

it necessary to use the terms *natural* and *moral* inability." That he made great use of this distinction in his preaching, and in his private conversations with sinners, all who were intimately acquainted with him, know full well. The same may be said of Dr. Griffin, and of all those New England ministers, whose labors were crowned with such signal success near the close of the last, and at the beginning of the present century. They thought they found it of use in pressing obligation upon the consciences of sinners, while at the same time they exhibited clearly their entire dependence on the agency of the Holy Spirit.

There are those who make this distinction in reality though not in form. They hold that the inability ascribed to sinners in the Scriptures, is altogether of the moral kind; that it consists solely in a wicked heart, or perverse inclination. At the same time they hold that sinners possess all those intellectual and moral powers which are essential to moral agency, and which render them utterly inexcusable for disobeying one of God's commands. But they object to calling the possession of these powers natural ability, or ability of any kind. But this objection seems to me to be groundless. I can not see why it is not proper to say that a person is, in some sense, able to do what he could do if he were rightly disposed. That this is true in regard to external actions, will be admitted. Who would hesitate to say, that a rich miser is able to give liberally to benevolent objects? But he may be as truly unable to give as the sinner is to repent, and for the same reason, *viz.*, that he has no heart to give. Who would feel authorized to say that he has *no power* to give, that he is in every sense unable? But why may not this be said as truly as it can be said that the sinner has no power to repent? Is it said, he can give if he will? But if he is under a moral inability to give, he can not will to give. He can no more choose to give than the sinner can hate his sins. He could give if he were rightly disposed; and for this reason we say he is not in every sense unable to give. And the sinner could repent if he were rightly disposed, and for this reason we say, he is not in every sense unable to repent. And I see not why the language is not as proper in one case as in the other. If the fact that the miser possesses everything which is necessary to enable him to give, but a right disposition, renders it proper to say, he has ability to give; then the fact that the sinner possesses everything which is necessary to enable him to repent, but a right disposition, renders it proper to say that he has ability to repent.

But it may be asked, what can the sinner do to get a right disposition? And what can the miser do to get a right disposition? But he labors under no inability which destroys or impairs his obligation to give, or which furnishes him with the least excuse. Therefore we say, he is not

in every sense unable to give. So the sinner labors under no inability which destroys or impairs his obligation to repent, or which furnishes him with the least excuse. Therefore we say he is not in every sense unable to repent. I can not see, therefore, that there is any valid objection to making the distinction in form as well as in reality. And it seems to me that there is an advantage in making it in form, as it enables us to press upon the consciences of sinners, their obligations with more clearness and force. It opens a field of illustration which is of great use in explaining to sinners the nature of their inability, and showing them that it furnishes them with no excuse. Tell a sinner that he has no ability whatever to repent and love God, and he feels that you have furnished him with a good excuse for remaining impenitent.* But show him that he is no more unable to repent than an avaricious man is to be liberal, or a revengeful man to forgive an injury, or a rebellious child to be dutiful to his parents, and he sees that his inability, so far from excusing him, is the very thing for which he is guilty. One thing is certain, those New England ministers who have been most conversant with revivals, have made much use of this distinction, and have felt it to be of great importance.

---

*Dr. Porter, in his eleventh lecture on Homiletics, has the following remark. "Tell impenitent sinners that they have no sort of power to repent, while in the same breath you exhort them to repentance, on pain of eternal misery, and if they have capacity enough to understand your meaning, they pronounce it utterly absurd. Give them what you call conclusive arguments from Scripture, and from metaphysics; they may be confounded perhaps, but not convinced. And why should it be strange if they feel indignant, when gravely addressed, on the most weighty of all subjects, in a strain that would be mockery and nonsense, if applied to any human concern besides religion?"

The following extract is from the discourses of Dr. Smalley to which reference has already been made. "On the whole, I am not able to conceive how any one who enters into the matter, can question the propriety of making the distinction insisted on in these discourses; or with what appearance of reason any can pretend it is an useless distinction. As to the importance of it, it may easily be observed in how many instances, upon the most leading points, and in the most material respects, by the help of this distinction, common sense will cross the common notions of sinners exactly where the Bible crosses them. It sets reason and Scripture, divine justice and divine grace, in quite a consistent view; whereas without it, I apprehend they must forever appear irreconcilable." He says again, "As to the foundation there is for the distinction, we have seen the Bible is as express and full in making the difference supposed, as it is in any one thing whatever. We have seen that all the heart, soul, mind and strength, that is, a perfectly willing and faithful exertion of all our faculties, however enfeebled they are, is all that God requires of us in his perfect law. Nor is there a single instance of natural impossibilities being required of any man, in all the sacred records. Nor is it once intimated that *natural* impossibilities might justly be required of us, because our natural powers were impaired by the fall. But on the other hand, we have seen that the most absolute *moral* impossibilities are required of all men without the least scruple, as if there was no kind of difficulty in them."

Fears have been expressed in some quarters, that the tendency of maintaining this distinction is to the adoption of Pelagian and Arminian errors. It is a sufficient answer to this to say, that no theological writer, in the English language, at least, ever did so much toward overthrowing Pelagianism and Arminianism as President Edwards, and that this very distinction was one of the weapons by which he accomplished the work. The younger Edwards, speaking of his father, says, "Before him, the *Calvinists* were nearly driven out of the field, by the *Arminians*, *Pelagians* and *Socinians*. The Calvinists, it is true, appealed to Scripture, as the best of all authority, in support of their peculiar tenets. But how was the Scripture to be understood? They were pressed and embarrassed by the objection, *that the sense in which they interpreted the sacred writings, was inconsistent with human liberty, moral agency, accountableness, praise and blame.* It was consequently inconsistent with all command and exhortation, with all reward and punishment. Their interpretation must of course be erroneous, and an entire perversion of Scripture. How absurd, it was urged, that a man totally dead, should be called upon to arise, and perform the duties of the living and sound—that we should need a divine influence to give us a new heart, and yet be commanded to make us a new heart and a right spirit—that a man has no power to come to Christ, and yet be commanded to come to him on pain of damnation! The Calvinists themselves began to be ashamed of their own cause, and to give it up, so far at least, as relates to liberty and necessity. This was true especially of Dr. Watts and Dr. Doddridge, who in their day, were counted leaders of the Calvinists. They must needs bow in the house of Rimmon, and admit the *self-determining power;* which once admitted, and pursued to its ultimate results, overthrows the doctrines of regeneration, our dependence for renewing and sanctifying grace, of absolute decrees, of the saint's perseverance, and the whole system of doctrines usually denominated the *doctrines of grace.* But Mr. Edwards put an end to this seeming triumph of those who were thus hostile to that system of doctrines. This he accomplished by POINTING OUT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NATURAL AND MORAL NECESSITY AND INABILITY, by showing the absurdity, the manifold contradictions, the inconceivableness and the impossibility of a *self-determining* power," &c.

Now if the distinction between Natural and Moral Inability, was one of the weapons by which Edwards overthrew Pelagianism and Arminianism, why should it be thought that the maintaining of this distinction leads to the adoption of *Pelagian* and *Arminian* errors? Besides, who were ever more decided opponents of these errors, than Edwards, Smalley, Dwight, and the whole host of New England Calvinists?

# DISCOURSE.

II. Cor. viii. 12. "For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not."

It is a maxim of Scripture, that God looketh on the heart. In estimating human character, he regards not merely the external conduct of men, but the motives by which they are actuated. If these are pure, he looks upon them with complacency. But if these are not pure, he reprobates their services, although their actions may be conformed to the letter of the precept. This is a principle of universal application in the divine government.

In the chapter from which the text is taken, the Apostle is exhorting the Corinthians to deeds of beneficence. He informs them that the Lord loveth a cheerful giver, and assures them, moreover, that the performance of their duty did not depend so much on the amount of their benefactions, as on the temper and spirit by which they were actuated. The first thing required of them was a willing mind, or a benevolent heart; and where this existed, their benefactions would be acceptable to God, although they might be able to bestow but little. The idea is this. Every individual ought to be willing to contribute according to his ability, and he who is thus willing, and acts accordingly, performs his duty. The mite bestowed by a poor man from benevolent motives, is equally acceptable to God, with the abundance bestowed by a rich man from the same motives. God does not require of the poor what he does of the rich, for the simple reason that they are not able to do as much as the rich. If a person has a benevolent disposition his offering will be accepted according to his ability.

The principle here laid down is applicable not only to this particular branch of duty, but to all branches of duty. The text, therefore, may be considered as teaching this general doctrine:

*God does not require of men what they have no power to do.*

To illustrate and establish this doctrine, will be the object of the present discourse.

When I say that God does not require of men what they have no power to do, I use the word power in its ordinary sense. We say a man has power to do a thing, when he possesses all those faculties of body, or mind, or both, which are necessary to enable him to do it, if it is his desire or wish to do it. We do not always, nor generally, include the desire or wish in the idea of power. We often say that a man has power to do what he has no desire to do, and what he never will do, unless his heart shall be changed. Thus we say, every rich man has power to give liberally to benevolent objects. But some rich men are so avaricious that they will not give at all.

Every child has power to obey the reasonable commands of his parents. But some children are obstinately disobedient.

You will not understand me, therefore, to affirm that God never requires of men what they have no inclination to do. If he did not, there would be no such thing as disobedience. He does require of some men, things to which they are so utterly disinclined, that they never will do them unless their inclinations are changed by the power of God.

Now, this disinclination, this opposition of heart, is sometimes represented in the Scriptures as an inability,—and this use of language prevails in the common discourses of men. Persons not unfrequently say that they can not do, what they have no inclination to do, when it is manifest that there is no other inability in the case. Tell a man to leap from a precipice, into a deep abyss, and he will tell you he can not. But he has strength enough to do it. Tell a good man, to blaspheme his Maker; he will tell you he can not. But he has the power of speech, and needs no new physical power to enable him to utter blasphemy. Why then can he not blaspheme his Maker? Because he has no inclination to do it. All men sometimes use the term can not, and other terms of the same import, in this sense; and they are so used in the Scriptures.

There are, therefore, two kinds of inability. And they have been called by divines, Natural and Moral Inability. These terms are not used in the Scriptures, and it is not, perhaps, necessary that they should be used in preaching. But the distinction

which they are employed to designate, is evidently recognized in the Scriptures, and is of great practical importance.

There is a sense in which sinners are unable to do what God requires. Thus it is said, that Joseph's brethren *could not* speak peaceably unto him. Joshua said unto the people, "Ye *can not* serve the Lord." And our Saviour said, "No man *can* come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." But who believes that the sons of Jacob were unable to speak peaceably to their brethren, in the same sense in which a dumb man is unable to speak at all? Who believes that Joshua or Christ meant to affirm that sinners are unable to serve the Lord, and to come to Christ, in the same sense in which they are unable to lift a mountain, or to create a world? Who does not know that the inability of a rich miser to give liberally, is of a different kind from that of a benevolent poor man who has nothing to give? Nothing, therefore, can be plainer than that the distinction of which I have been speaking, does exist; whatever may be the technical terms by which it is designated, or whether it be designated by any technical terms or not.

Now, the doctrine which I have deduced from the text, is, that God does not require of men, what they have *no power* to perform. You will observe that I do not affirm, that sinners have *all power* to do their duty—in other words, that they are able *in every sense*, to do whatever God requires. I admit that there is a sense in which they are unable. This the Scriptures clearly teach. But this inability does not consist in the want of physsical power, but in the want of a disposition. It is altogether of a moral kind. It does not furnish the sinner with any excuse. It is not represented as a calamity merely, but a sin. Sinners are not represented in the Scriptures as exerting themselves to the utmost to do their duty, and as failing for the want of power; but as being totally averse to their duty. This aversion is so great that nothing short of the agency of the Holy Spirit will subdue it. Hence it is called an inability. But you will perceive that it is a very different kind of inability from that which furnishes an excuse. Tell a man to pluck the sun from the firmament, or to weigh the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance; he can not do it, for he has not sufficient strength. He can not do it, if he would. This is what is called Natural

Inability. If sinners were, in this sense, unable to obey the commands of God, they would be perfectly excusable. We never blame a person for not doing what he has *no power* to do. No man ever supposed that a blind man was blamable for not seeing, or a deaf man for not hearing, or a man who has lost the use of his limbs for not walking, or an idiot for not exercising the faculties of a rational agent. Nor is it supposable that a command given by any authority whatever, can make it the duty of an individual to exert powers either of body or of mind, which he does not possess. If a parent should command a child to perform service which required the strength of a giant, we should say without hesitation, that the command imposed no obligation upon the child, and that he incurred no guilt in disobeying. But suppose the child has no inclination to obey the reasonable commands of his parent; suppose his disinclination to be so great, that it becomes an inveterate obstinacy, and amounts to what is denominated a moral inability: in that case we say that the child is blamable. And we say moreover, without the least hesitation, that his guilt is in proportion to his obstinacy. So in every other case. That inability which consists in a disinclination, never excuses. The sinner's inability to obey God, is a sinful inability, and the greater it is, the greater is his guilt.

When I say, therefore, that God does not require of men, what they have *no power* to do, my meaning is, that all his commands are limited by the faculties which he has given them; that he does not require of them what they might not do, were they rightly disposed; that they have all the power which is necessary to render them proper subjects of moral government, and to render their disobedience in every instance, utterly inexcusable.

I now proceed to establish the doctrine of the text.

1. I argue the truth of this doctrine from the character of God.

That God is the moral governor of the world, will not be questioned. Nor will it be questioned that he is a righteous moral governor. But I would ask how his character can be vindicated, on the supposition that he has given commands to his creatures which they have no power to obey! The supposition certainly contradicts all our notions of justice in a moral governor.

Let us look at the application of this principle in those inferior systems of moral government established among men. See it applied by parents in the government of their children, by masters in the government of their servants, and by rulers in the government of their subjects. Suppose a father should command his child, under the severest penalty, to do what the child has no power to do: what would be thought of such a father? Could his character be vindicated? Suppose a master should require of his servant a task which the servant has no power to perform: would that master be righteous? We have heard of the taskmasters of Egypt, who required of the Israelites what they had no power to perform; and who of us has not pronounced them barbarous and cruel? Suppose the government of a state should impose upon the people exorbitant taxes—taxes which the people are utterly unable to pay. Who would not pronounce that government to be tyrannical and oppressive? And can we believe that the Supreme Ruler of the universe has adopted a principle in the administration of his government, which in its application to all human governments is so obviously unjust? Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? Are not his ways equal? But, my hearers, can you feel that it would be right for God to require of you what you have absolutely no power to do? Can any rational creature in the universe, feel that it would be right? And is this the character of God? Are his commands thus unreasonable? Is it a fact, that when he commands his creatures to love him, to repent and believe the gospel, they are in the same sense unable to do it, that they are to create a world? If so, I would ask, how it is possible that his character should be esteemed and adored by his creatures? How is it possible that all the world shall stand guilty before him, when he comes to judgment? And how is it possible that the consciences of men or angels should acquiesce in the decision, when he shall pass sentence upon the ungodly?

But, my hearers, it is not so. There is not unrighteousness with God. He is not a hard Master, reaping where he has not sown, and gathering where he has not strewed. He is a righteous moral governor. He has created a world of intelligent and rational creatures, and clothed them with all the powers of moral

agency. He has given them understanding to perceive the rule of duty, a conscience to feel obligation, and a will to choose. And he has given them a law suited to their capacities, and to the relations they sustain to him and to their fellow-creatures, and there is not one precept of his law which is not perfectly reasonable. But they have disobeyed and forfeited his favor. In infinite mercy he has introduced a system of grace. He has provided an atonement and offered them pardon on the most reasonable conditions. For refusing to comply with these conditions, they have not the least excuse.

Let me request you, my hearers, to look through the gospel, and observe the manner in which God addresses his sinful creatures. Look at his invitations, his entreaties, and his expostulations. What sincerity can there be in these invitations and entreaties, if men have no more power to turn from sin to holiness than they have to control the elements? Look at his commands and threatenings. Are these addressed to beings who have absolutely no ability to obey? And let it be remembered, that God not only threatens, but he puts his threatenings into execution. He actually sends men to perdition for disobeying his precepts, and slighting his offers of mercy. And have they, after all, absolutely no power? Does God punish his creatures eternally for not doing what they have *no* power to do? Who can believe this to be the character of God? Were such an opinion of his character to prevail throughout his dominions, every angel would drop his harp, and veil himself in sackcloth, and the whole universe would be filled with mourning, lamentation and wo.

There is one way in which an attempt has been made to evade the force of this reasoning. It has been said that mankind have destroyed their own power to obey the divine commandments, and therefore may justly be held bound to do all of which they were originally made capable. But, I would ask, how have they destroyed their own power? Have they put out the light of reason, that they can not know their duty? Have they extinguished conscience, that they can not feel obligation? Have they annihilated the power of volition, that they can not choose between good and evil? In short, have they destroyed their rational nature, and reduced themselves to the condition of

idiots or brutes? If not, they have not destroyed their own power. While they possess the faculties which have been mentioned, they are moral agents, and capable of obedience, and possessing these faculties, they will continue to be moral agents forever. They can no more divest themselves of moral agency, than they can annihilate their souls, or destroy their rational nature.

But supposing mankind had destroyed their own power, this would not make it right in God to require of them what they have no power to do, or to punish them for not doing it.

Let me state a case. Suppose a child who dislikes the service required of him by his father, wickedly exposes his health and brings himself upon a bed of sickness. Thus by his own fault he disables himself from performing the service required by his father. Now, suppose his father should every day command him to rise from his bed and perform the service which he had required, and not only so, but chastise him for not doing it? What would you think of such a father? Or, suppose a servant, that he might not be obliged to labor, should cut off his own hand. His master might justly blame him for thus disabling himself; but if in addition to this, he should daily assign him his wonted task, and daily punish him for not performing it, who would not pronounce him tyrannical and cruel?

But it has been asked, if a man has squandered his property, and thus rendered himself unable to discharge his honest debts, is he not still under obligation to pay them? I answer: by squandering his property, he may have rendered himself as blameworthy, as he would have *done* by refusing to pay his debts when he was able to pay them. But in what does his sin consist? In not paying his debts when he is unable to pay? or in squandering his property and thus putting it out of his power to pay? Most obviously in the latter. It is for this that he is blamed, both by men and by God.

Besides, the case as above stated does not exactly represent the case in question. If mankind have destroyed their power to obey God, when and how have they done it! Not by any act of theirs, since they were born; but by the act of Adam as their representative. Now to make the cases parallel, suppose a man should involve himself in debt and squander his property,

thus putting it out of his own power, and out of the power of his children, to discharge the debt. Are the children, while in a state of abject poverty, under obligation to pay the debt. Suppose he has bound his heirs and assigns forever; can he, can any man, lay his heirs under a moral obligation to do what they have no power to do, simply because their inability is the consequence of his fault.

It is true that in consequence of the sin of Adam, mankind come into the world depraved and are, in a certain sense, unable to do their duty. But the inability under which they labor, is a moral inability, *i. e.*, an inability of disinclination. Although it is natural to man, it is entirely different from that which divines have denominated, natural inability, and which always excuses from blame. When Adam apostatized, his disposition became perverse: but he lost none of those natural faculties which were necessary to render him capable of obedience. As it was with Adam, so it is with his posterity. Their hearts are alienated from God; but they possess all the powers which are necessary to render them proper subjects of moral government. But if they were in every sense unable to obey God, they would not be responsible. It is not true, therefore, that mankind have destroyed their own power.

That God does not require of men what they have no power to do, I argue,

2. From the nature of the requirements themselves. If you look through the Bible, my hearers, and examine carefully the divine commandments, you can not fail to be convinced that none of them are grievous. They are all limited by the faculties of those on whom they are imposed. God does not require us to make unto ourselves any new faculties, or to employ in his service those which we do not possess. All that he requires is, that we should serve and glorify him to the extent of the powers which he has given us. He does not require a child to exert the strength of a giant, nor an idiot to exercise the faculties of a rational agent. He does not require of the poor man those acts of beneficence which he requires of the rich. "If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. This is a limitation which extends to all the divine require-

ments. David did well that it was in his heart to build a house unto the Lord, although he was not able to carry his pious design into execution.

Look at the parable of the talents, which was evidently intended to illustrate the principle of God's moral government. The servant to whom two talents were committed was not blamed because he did not employ five in his master's service; nor was the servant to whom but one talent was committed, blamed because he did not employ two, but because he refused to employ the one with which he was entrusted. Is it not perfectly evident from this parable, that God does not require of men what they have no power to do?

But look at the moral law. What is the sum of its requirements? "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Observe, God does not require us to love him more than with *all* our heart, soul, strength and mind—that is, only to the extent of our faculties, nor does he require us to love our neighbor more than ourselves. "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." They comprehend the whole duty of man; and if these precepts do not require of us what we have no power to perform, we shall search in vain for any that do.

We see therefore, that the inability which is ascribed to men in the Scriptures, must be altogether of the moral kind. It is, indeed, easy to show that whenever men are represented in the Scriptures, as unable to obey the divine commands, nothing more is ever intended, than an utter disinclination. Thus when it is said of Joseph's brethren, "They *could not* speak peaceably unto him," what are we to understand by the declaration? Had they *no power* whatever to speak peaceably? Were they not as capable of speaking peaceably, as of speaking reproachfully? But the Scriptures have informed us, in what their inability consisted. "They could not speak peaceably unto him, because they hated him." This was their inability. So long as they hated him they had no disposition to speak peaceably unto him.

Again. Our Saviour said, "No man can come unto me, ex-

cept the Father which hath sent me, draw him." Here you will observe that sinners need to be drawn by the Father in order to come to Christ. But why do they need to be drawn? Because they are unwilling to come. For a moral agent to be drawn, is to be made willing. We are not to suppose that God brings sinners to Christ against their wills. If they were inclined to come, they would not need to be drawn. The fact, therefore, that they are disinclined, is the only reason that they need to be drawn, and the only reason that they can not come. And when our Saviour says. "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him," his meaning is the same as when he says, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life."

Again. Our Saviour said to the Jews, "How *can* ye believe, who receive honor one of another?" Here the reason is assigned why they could not believe. It was because they loved the praise of man more than the praise of God. They consequently had no inclination to seek that honor which cometh from God only.

Again. It is written, "The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither *indeed can be*." Why can it not be subject to the law of God? Because it is enmity against God. "So then," for this reason, because the carnal mind is enmity against God, "they that are in the flesh *can not* please God." The reason that unrenewed men can not be subject to the law of God, and can not please God, is that their hearts are opposed to him. They do not love his law, but delight in the ways of disobedience. And so in every case, when inability to obey God is ascribed to men in the Scriptures, it is an inability of disinclination. It is not spoken of as a calamity merely, but as a sin. They are not represented as being unable to do their duty because all their powers are prostrated and destroyed, but because they are averse to their duty. And this aversion is so great that nothing short of the Almighty energy of the Holy Spirit will subdue it.

## Remarks.

1. In preaching the gospel, clear and discriminating views of man's ability and inability are exceedingly important. There

are two extremes, on this subject, into which preachers are liable to run, both of which should be carefully avoided.

If the preacher affirms, *without qualification*, that sinners are able to do whatever God requires, there is danger that he will be understood to mean, whether such be his intention or not, that they are able in every sense,—that they really labor under no inability whatever. If he makes this impression on the minds of his hearers, it will be a false impression, for it is abundantly evident from the Scriptures that there is a sense in which sinners are unable to do their duty. And this impression will not only be false, but dangerous. It will lead sinners to entertain erroneous views in regard to their own depravity, and in regard to the necessity of the Spirit's agency. It will also tend to quiet them in their sins, by fostering the belief that they can at any time secure their salvation. Thousands, there is reason to fear, have thus been lulled into carnal security by unscriptural notions of their own ability.

On the other hand, if the preacher asserts *without qualification, or explanation*, that sinners are unable to do what God requires, he will be in danger of making an erroneous impression.* His

---

* It may be said that the Scriptures assert, without qualification, the sinner's inability, and nowhere assert that he has ability to do his duty. But does not God virtually assert the ability for which we contend, in every command, in every invitation, and in every threatening, which is addressed to sinners? It is admitted that if mankind did not possess all the faculties which are essential to moral agency, they would not be responsible. But the Scriptures nowhere assert that men are moral agents, or that they possess the faculties which are essential to moral agency. But this, we are told, is not necessary, because the possession of these faculties is taken for granted and implied in every divine command. If then, as we maintain, the possession of these faculties constitutes what we call natural ability, this ability is taken for granted and implied in every divine command.

I would seriously inquire if it is not a self-evident truth that no man can be under obligation to do what he has absolutely no power to do? In regard to external actions it will be admitted that this is true. And why not in regard to exercises of the heart? What is the reason that a man can not feel under obligation to perform an external action which is beyond his power? Can any other reason be assigned, except that he is unable to perform it? Is not this, of itself, a good and sufficient reason? Is it not all the reason which a man ever feels it necessary to assign to satisfy his own conscience or to satisfy any reasonable man? But if this is a good and sufficient reason in this case, why is it not in all cases? If a man is commanded to possess a state of mind which he is as unable to possess, as he is to lift a mountain, why does not this inability exonerate him from blame as much in the one case as in the other? There is no way to answer this, but to say, that the inability in one case is very

hearers will be likely to understand him to mean, that sinners have no power whatever to do their duty, that they are unable in every sense of the term. But this, as we have seen, is not true. And it is a dangerous error. Let sinners get the idea, that they have no power whatever to obey God's commands and they will feel that they are under no obligation to obey them. No man ever felt, no man ever will feel, and I venture to say, no man ever can feel, under obligation to do what he is in every sense unable to do. So long as sinners believe that they are thus unable to repent and believe the gospel, they will feel that they have nothing to do, but to wait God's time. Multitudes are quieting themselves in their sins with this delusion, and are treasuring up to themselves wrath against the day of wrath, and there is no hope of their conversion till this delusion is dispelled. In order to preach the gospel faithfully, man's obligation and dependence must be held in an even scale. Both must be clearly exhibited. Neither must be kept in the back-ground, neither must be dwelt upon to the neglect of the other, for they are equally important. The sinner's obligation to obey immediately every divine command should be pressed upon his conscience, and his entire depravity and consequent dependence on the Holy Spirit should be as clearly exhibited. The impression should not be made on his mind that he has nothing to do but to wait God's time, nor should the impression be made upon his mind, that he can safely wait his own time. He should be shown that he has not the least excuse for continuing another moment in a state of impenitence; and he should also be shown that such is the desperate wickedness of his heart, that he never will repent unless God shall renew him by his grace. The clear exhibition of these truths has often been a sharp two-edged

different from what it is in the other. If this is true, then he is not in every sense unable, and there is some sense in which he is able, and we ought not to ascribe to him inability in an unqualified sense.

Suppose I should assert that sinners have no power to obey God, and therefore are not moral agents. And suppose that in vindication of my position, I should say, the Scriptures declare that sinners are unable to do what God requires, and they nowhere assert that they are moral agents. Would this be deemed satisfactory? If not, why? Because, it is said, man's moral agency is taken for granted in every divine command. So man's natural ability is taken for granted in every divine command. It is admitted to be a self-evident truth, that if men were not moral agents, they would not be responsible. To my mind it is equally self-evident that if they have no sort of ability to obey God's commands, they are not responsible.

sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and the spirit, the joints and the marrow. It was by the clear exhibition of these truths in their due proportion, that the preaching of those New England ministers was particularly characterized, whose labors were crowned with such signal success in the early part of the present century.

But shall we tell men that they can and they can't, that they are able and unable? Is not this to preach contradictions? I answer, if we were to tell men that they are able to repent and unable in the same sense, this would indeed be a contradiction. But is it a contradiction to tell them that they are in one sense able and in another sense unable? May not a man be able to do what he has no inclination to do? And if a disinclination is properly called an inability, may he not be both able and unable?

That sinners are in some sense unable to obey God, the Scriptures explicitly teach. I have quoted several passages which are plain and decisive. But do the Scriptures teach that men are in the same sense unable to do their duty, that they are to lift a mountain or to create a world? If not, then there are different kinds of inability, and there is a foundation for the distinction which divines have made on this subject. And in preaching the gospel it is of great importance that we keep this distinction clearly in view. Otherwise we shall make the impression on the minds of sinners, either that they have full power in themselves to do their duty, and are not dependent on the Holy Spirit, or that having no power whatever, they are excusable for their impenitence and unbelief; either of which impressions is false and dangerous.

There is another view that has been taken of this subject, which, while it attempts to avoid the two extremes that I have mentioned, runs into other errors equally dangerous. It is the view which ascribes to men not a *natural* but a *gracious* ability. The advocates of this scheme maintain that mankind by the fall lost all ability to love and obey God, and that they are now in every sense unable to do their duty, till God by his grace enables them to do it. But they maintain that in consequence of the atonement of Christ, the Holy Spirit is sent to strive with sinners, and that some grace is given to all men, so that with this help, they are now able to do what God requires.

The great error of this scheme, is, that it subverts the whole

system of grace. If man has no ability to do his duty without grace, God is in justice bound either to give him grace, or to excuse him from doing his duty. But can that be grace which God in justice is bound to give? Grace is favor to the guilty—favor which God is under no obligation to bestow. According to this scheme, therefore, grace is no more grace.

It is true that fallen man, without the assistance of the Holy Spirit, will never perform one spiritual duty. But this assistance man can not claim as his due. It is a gratuitous favor which God is under no obligation to bestow; and whether it be bestowed or withheld, the sinner's duty remains the same. The sinner can not say, that unless God grants me the aids of his grace, I am not under obligation to obey his commands. If he were not under obligation without grace, he could not be guilty without grace. Consequently he could not be an object of grace, for grace is favor to the guilty and to none others.

The Holy Spirit is not given to render man a moral and accountable being. Man's moral agency was not lost by the fall. Of course it is no part of the system of grace to restore it. The Holy Spirit is given to convince men of sin, and to subdue their rebellious hearts; not to render men under obligation to obey, but to incline them to obey their Maker. If they were naturally inclined to obey, their inclination would not need to be changed by the power of the Holy Ghost. If they were naturally inclined to come to Christ, they would not need to be drawn by the Father. Sinners are not so disabled from doing their duty as to render them excusable without divine help. The help which they need is, *strictly speaking*, gracious help: help, of course, which God is under no obligation to grant. It consequently implies no inability on the part of the sinner, but a moral inability, of which God makes no account whatever in his commands and threatenings.

This subject may serve to give us just views of the doctrines of grace. The principal objection to these doctrines is founded on the presumption that they are inconsistent with the moral agency of man. They are supposed to represent the human race in a state of ruin from which they have absolutely no power to extricate themselves. Consequently they are supposed, to be at war with the whole system of moral government, and with all the commands, invitations and threatenings of the

Bible. But this is altogether a mistake. Those who are in the habit of contemplating the doctrines of grace in this manner, view them with perverted vision.

These doctrines are not at all at variance with the moral government of God. On the contrary, they suppose throughout that God is a righteous moral governor, that mankind are the subjects of his government, that all his requirements are perfectly reasonable, and that men have no excuse for their disobedience. They do not represent the human race as in a helpless condition, only in a moral sense. They do indeed teach that this is a revolted world; that men are depraved, and totally depraved; that they need to be born again, and that the salvation of men is effected solely by the free and sovereign grace of God, according to his eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus before the world began. But all this does not militate against the doctrine which I have endeavored to establish.

When we speak of men as totally depraved, we do not mean that they are machines. If they were so, they could not be depraved in a moral sense. Depravity, when applied to men, denotes a state of guilt. But guilt is predicable only of moral agents—of those who are capable of obedience; for such only are capable of sinning. We do not mean that the faculties of men are so impaired that they have *no power* to obey the commands of God; but we mean that they have no inclination to obey—that they love rebellion and obstinately refuse to yield allegiance to the God who made them.

And when we say that sinners must be born again, we do not mean that this change is necessary because men have no power to do their duty, but because they are averse to their duty. No new faculties are imparted in regeneration. The change is altogether of a moral kind. It is a change of the inclination. Thus it is represented in the Scriptures. "A new heart will I give you, and a right spirit will I put within you." "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." The difference between the regenerate and the unregenerate man is, the one is inclined to obey God, and the other is disinclined. Both possess equally all the powers which are essential to moral agency. But while one is disposed to make a right use of his powers, the other is disposed to pervert them to purposes of sin. We see then that the doctrine of regeneration does not

involve the idea that men have *no* power to obey God's commandments. And the same may be said of all the doctrines of grace. The reason that salvation is all of grace is not that the powers of men are so prostrated that they are rendered incapable of obedience. If it were so, there would be no grace in their salvation. Grace is favor to the guilty. But if mankind have no power to obey God, they have no power to sin and are not subjects of guilt. It is the exceeding wickedness of men which renders their salvation such a display of divine grace.

That you may have correct views of the system of grace, look at the Divine Being as the moral governor of the universe. Look at the human race as accountable subjects of his government. See them placed under a righteous law, which they have violated without the least justifiable reason, and thus brought themselves under a just condemnation. See the Almighty Sovereign looking with an eye of mercy on this race of rebels, and giving his Son to be a propitiation for their guilt. See him offering them pardon on the most reasonable conditions. See him inviting, entreating, warning, and urging them by all the motives which the universe can furnish, to secure their immortal interests; and see them despising the riches of his goodness, and spurning from them his offers of mercy, and thus increasing the guilt of their rebellion a hundred fold. Now, my hearers, behold this compassionate Sovereign reaching forth his almighty hand and touching the hearts of these rebels and melting them into contrition. Here is grace. Grace which may well astonish the universe. Grace which will fill all heaven with acclamations of joy when the top stone of the spiritual temple shall be laid, and which will tune the harps of the redeemed to nobler anthems than ever angels sung. But deny to man all ability to obey the divine commands, and you subvert the whole system of grace.

3. This subject teaches us the guilt and danger of those who excuse and justify their disobedience, with the plea of inability. This is a common plea with which sinners attempt to parry the sword of the Spirit, and to ward off conviction of sin. When the claims of God are urged upon them, they instantly resort to this refuge of lies. Tell them to repent, they can not; to love God, they can not; to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, they can not; and it is evident that by the inability which they plead, they do not mean a moral inability merely, but a natural inabil-

ity. They mean to assert not only that they have no inclination to perform the duties required, but that they have *no power;* for they do not make use of this plea to criminate themselves, but to exculpate themselves. But, my hearers, if the doctrine of this discourse is true, this plea of the sinner is false. He labors under no inability which furnishes him with the least excuse. All the impediment which lies in the way of his obedience is a rebellious heart. He is bent on rebellion, and so inveterate is his opposition to holiness, that nothing but divine power will subdue it. This is the reason, and the only reason that he can not obey the divine commandments. And does this excuse him? Or is not this the very thing for which he is guilty? And is not his guilt in proportion to the strength of his perverse inclination? For what, let me ask, can a man be blamable if not for being opposed to God and his law? And if there are degrees of guilt, who are the most guilty, those who have the most, or those who have the least of this opposition?

It may here be asked, can the sinner change his inclination? If he can not, how can he be blamable? To this I would reply: Suppose a man has such malice in his heart toward his neighbor that no motives will dissuade him from imbruing his hands in his blood. Can he change his inclination? And if not, how can he be criminal? And is the murderer blameless, because he perpetrated the horrid deed with malice prepense? Or is not this the very essence of his crime?

If a perverse inclination is an excuse for disobedience, every sin in the universe is excused; and every law whether human or divine, which requires of men what they have no inclination to perform, is tyrannical and oppressive. All the horrid crimes which have been perpetrated on earth, and all the malignity and blasphemy of the fallen spirits in hell, may be justified on the plea we are considering. And is it so? Is there no sin in the universe? Are all actions equally right? Then God is not a moral governor. There is no law, and no retribution, and the Bible is a fable. If we are not prepared to admit all these consequences, we must say that the sinner's plea of inability is false.

And it is not only false, but impious; for so long as the sinner urges this plea, he wages open war with his Maker. Suppose you were to see a parent giving commands to his child. The child says that he can not obey them. The parent repeats

his commands and enforces them with threatenings of severe punishment. Still the child refuses to obey and persists in justifying his disobedience. Would you not say that there was a controversy between that child and his parent?

And how stands the case between God and the sinner? God commands the sinner, on penalty of eternal death, to repent and believe the gospel. The sinner declares that he can not obey; and thus virtually accuses his Maker of injustice. And is not this impiety?

But this plea is not only false and impious, but infinitely hazardous. While the sinner thus justifies himself, he is hardening his heart, blinding his conscience, and rushing on to inevitable ruin. So long as he can convince himself that he has no power to obey the divine commands, he will not feel blamable for his disobedience. Consequently it is impossible that he should be convicted, or converted. Without conviction of sin, there can be no repentance for sin, and consequently no pardon nor salvation. But what is conviction? It is a sense of guilt. But no man feels guilty for not doing what he has no power to do. While the sinner, therefore, cherishes the belief that he has no power to obey the divine commands, he is taking the most direct way to seal his eternal ruin. Until he can be driven from this ground, there is no hope of his salvation.

Let me beseech all of my hearers who are in the habit of pleading this excuse, to bring this subject home to their consciences. Think, my friends, what you are doing. Dare you call your Maker's ways unjust? This you virtually do, every time you plead this excuse. One thing is certain, God's commands are reasonable, and it is your reasonable duty to obey them, or he is infinitely unjust in giving you these commands and he will be infinitely unjust in punishing you for disobedience. There is certainly blame somewhere; and the blame is infinite, for endless punishment is threatened and inflicted. Now the blame must lie on you or on God. If you say it does not lie on you, you cast it upon your Maker. And oh! think with whom you are contending. "Let the potsherds strive with the potsherds of earth, but woe to him that striveth with his Maker." "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

# A LETTER

TO

# THE REV. DR. TYLER,

IN REPLY TO HIS DISCOURSE ON

## Human Ability and Inability.

---

BY

JOSEPH HARVEY, D. D.,

**Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Thompsonville, Conn.**

---

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.:

SAMUEL BOWLES AND COMPANY, PRINTERS.

1855.

# LETTER.

THOMPSONVILLE, JAN. 10th, 1855.

DR. TYLER:

*Rev. and Dear Sir:*

I have received through the mail a copy of your Discourse on Human Ability and Inability, for which I return you my thanks. I imagine that, by sending me the Discourse, you intended to call my attention to the subject, and perhaps to invite me to express my views. Under this impression I am free to say, that your discourse presents to my mind some difficulties, which I proceed frankly and candidly to state in a few remarks for your consideration.

My first remark is, there is a want of affinity between the doctrine of your discourse and your text, and not only so, there is a manifest variance between the two.

Your text is found in 2 Cor. vii. 10. "For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath and not according to that he hath not." The Apostle here speaks of the offerings of charity, not of the exercise of powers or the possession of powers at all. But, admitting that the principle involved may properly be applied to powers, still it appears to me that your doctrine cannot be found in the text. "For if there be first a willing mind." This is the salient point of the text on which all that follows depends. The true sentiment is, the willing mind is accepted in the use of such means and powers as a man has. Now what is the doctrine which you force from this passage? "God does not require of men what they have no power to do." If you had said, God does not require of men what, in connection with a willing mind, they have no power to do, your doctrine and text would have been in harmony. But you leave out the willing mind, you omit the limitation, and put forth your doctrine in the form of an universal proposition, applicable to all cases, willing or unwilling. What the Apostle says of a specific case, even that

of a right heart, you take and apply to all cases, even to cases directly the opposite of that specified, and say God does not require of men, without distinction, good or bad, willing or unwilling, saint or sinner, for you know that men compose these classes, what they have no power to do. Now if all this is true, one thing is certain, the text teaches no such thing.

Let us now look at the more serious part of the remark, viz. the variance between doctrine and text. If a willing mind is essential to acceptable service in the use of means and powers, as the text teaches, then no such service can be done without a willing mind, or with an unwilling mind. And if it cannot be done, then no man can have power to do it. You will admit that impenitent sinners have unwilling minds. If so, they have no power to do what God requires, because the willing mind is essential to such doing, it cannot be done without, and surely, they have no power to do what cannot be done. But does not God require of sinners, as well as of others, to do right? Does he not command them, one and all and everywhere, to repent? Does not God then require of all men, what some men, having unwilling minds, have no power to do? And is not this clearly the sentiment of your text. But your doctrine is, God does not require of men what they have no power to do. Your doctrine and your text therefore are in conflict. If I wished to prove directly the opposite of the doctrine of your discourse I could not desire more apposite testimony than that of your text, it is full and conclusive to that purpose. So it appears to me. The question is not can a sinner repent if he will? This is not the point at issue. Can he repent if he will not? This is the question to be answered. If you say he can, tell me how. Name the power he has to do it. Is it conscience, is it reason, is it intellect? Can conscience do it without a willing mind? It may produce remorse and lead a sinner, with Judas, to go and hang himself. But is this true repentance? Will God accept a rational or intellectual repentance without the heart? You will relieve the subject of great embarrassment, if you will specify and describe the power which a sinner has to do what God requires of him, with an unwilling mind. And surely if there be such a power it can be ascertained.

My second remark is, your doctrine is at variance with other parts of your discourse. In the first sentence you say, "It is a maxim of scripture that God looketh on the heart." This would seem to mean that God requires the heart as essential to acceptable service. In this view it is an unquestionable and invariable

maxim of scripture. And yet your doctrine says, "God does not require of men," of all men and every man without distinction, "what they have no power to do." This would seem to mean that God does not look on the heart at all. One of three things must be true of sinners in regard to power. Either they have power to do what God requires without the affections of the heart, or they have power to change their own hearts, or they have no power at all to the purpose. As you assert that they have power, and as I do not understand you to say they have power to change their own hearts, the conclusion is unavoidable that you mean to say, that sinners have power to do what God requires, without the affections of the heart, or, as the case is, with an unholy heart. How is this consistent with the truth that God looketh on the heart.

Again. Your doctrine conflicts with your definition of power. You say, "A man has power to do a thing, when he possesses all those faculties of body or mind or both, which enable him to do it, if it is his desire or wish to do it." Your doctrine is that men have power to do what God requires when they have no desire or wish to do it. Both of these cannot be the true account of power. One or the other is an error. Which is it, the definition or the doctrine? I should say the doctrine.

You say again that you use the word power in the ordinary sense, and here, in the face of your definition, you say, we do not always nor generally include the desire or wish in the idea of power, and assume that the ordinary use excludes these from the idea of power. Here we have a new issue, in regard to the ordinary sense of the word power, concerning which I remark, if by ordinary sense you mean scriptural usage, or general usage in regard to moral and religious subjects, I feel compelled, in justice to truth, to deny that you use the word in the ordinary sense. So far from this is the truth, that the word power is never used, so far as I am aware, in respect to these subjects without including the desire or wish, or what I suppose you mean, the affections of the heart. There is a good reason for this. If the affections of the heart be excluded, all the basis of morals and religion is removed. When Jacob wrestled and prevailed, his name was called Israel, because, as a prince, he had power with God. You will not suppose that Jacob overcame omnipotence by his physical strength. In what sense then had he power, but by his faith and the earnest desire of his heart? In John 1. 12 it is written, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." Does power

here mean natural faculty merely, and if natural men have this power, how came it to be given to them as believers? In Micah 3. 8. it is written, "I am full of power by the spirit of the Lord." Does power here mean natural faculty merely without the affections of the heart? But I need not multiply references. If there is a passage in the scriptures in which the word power, relating to moral or religious subjects, is used in the sense in which you use it, I have not been able to find it. The same may be said of common religious and theological usage. When we speak of the power of faith, the power of love, do we mean the natural faculties of body or mind or both, which are necessary to believe and love, without including the affections of the heart? When Paul speaks of the power of godliness, which some, who had the form, denied; did he mean natural faculty merely? It seems to me you must admit that the sense in which you use the word power is not the scriptural nor the religious sense. If by ordinary sense you mean, that of the common transactions of life, in relation to outward conduct in temporal affairs, then I must be permitted to enter a protest against the practice of introducing such a sense into the discussion of religious subjects and applying it to religious truth or duty. You say in your preface, that you do not see why the language is not as proper in the one case as in the other. Allow me to suggest a reason why it is not, which to my mind is conclusive. It is this. The relation between money and debts, between the physical strength of children and the reasonable commands of parents, and between the amount of property a man may possess, and that which he gives in charity, is entirely different from the relation between moral agency and duty required. Money, if sufficient in quantity, is full and perfect power to cancel a debt, without regard to motives or affections of the heart. Physical strength in children is full and perfect power to obey the commands of parents relating to outward action. The child having that strength has power to obey, be his desire or wish what it may. In these cases an outward act is required and that only, and physical strength is fully adequate to that act. The motives, in the sense in which you speak of power, are not taken into account. Neither the creditor nor the parent can take cognizance of the motive from which the debt is paid, or the command is complied with any farther than the motive is indicated by outward action If the outward act is performed the jurisdiction of human authority ceases. A debt may be paid unwillingly, a child may do unwillingly what a parent requires. A large sum may be given

in outward charity without a benevolent motive. Paul supposes that a man may give all his goods to feed the poor and have no true charity. Not so with moral agency, in respect to duty. In that relation the first and essential thing, as your text teaches, is a willing mind. No moral duty is done or can be done without the affections of the heart. The cases then are radically different. And it is, I apprehend, by mingling unwarrantably these two classes of relations and forcing analogies between them, as I think you have done in your discourse, that the obliquity and inconsistency of your doctrine have been elaborated. To make these relations at all analogous to each other you must raise these ordinary transactions to the platform of moral duties, and place them under the operation and bring them to the standard of moral law. And then they are no longer mere social transactions between man and man, but moral acts between the soul and God, who only can take cognizance of the heart. In that case your ordinary commercial sense of the word fails, and the moral sense, which always includes the affections of the heart, takes its place. I do not say that these ordinary transactions are not, in the sight of God, moral duties, or that men are not accountable for them as such; but I say that, as far as human cognizance and jurisdiction go, they are merely outward acts, and that by the outward act, without any regard to motive, every human demand is satisfied. When regarded as moral duties they stand on precisely the same ground with all other moral duties, in regard to which power always includes the affections of the heart. The ordinary sense of the word power, as it stands related to outward conduct, and transactions between men, which go for what they are worth to them, cannot be admitted into discussion of moral and religious subjects, and all who treat on those subjects are bound to use the word exclusively in the scriptural sense.

Again. There is a discrepancy between your doctrine and that part of your discourse, which says, "There is a sense in which sinners are unable to do what God requires. I admit there is a sense in which they are unable. This the scriptures clearly teach." Now this looks very much like contradiction. It seems to assert that sinners have power to do what they are unable to do. How is this? Your doctrine, "God does not require of men what they have no power to do." Or, to give the doctrine an affirmative form,—men, sinners though they are, have power to do all that God requires of them. To DO, observe, not to be obligated TO DO, but TO DO. Put your finger if you please on that word

DO, for we shall presently have occasion to recall it. Men are not required to do what they have no power to do. What is the meaning of that word DO? Webster defines it thus: "To perform, to execute, to carry into effect, to finish, to bring to a conclusion. God, then, does not require of men what they have no power to perform, to finish, to bring to a conclusion. Not to be obligated to do, not to do in part, not to begin, but to finish, to bring to a conclusion. Supposing you should see a man stand and look at a piece of work and say, I am unable to do it, I admit that I am unable, the scriptures clearly teach that I am unable, and yet I have power to do it, to finish, to bring it to a complete conclusion. What would you conclude about him? Would you not think that he was telling riddles? But here we are met by two senses. In one sense men can do what God requires, and in another sense they cannot. And this seeming contradiction is after all only a paradox. Let us see how this is. That there are propositions that are true in one sense and not in another, I do not deny. Is your doctrine one of them? To arrive at a correct solution of the question, let us inquire, are there two senses in which God requires duty to be done? Does He say in his law, let those that can do it, love the Lord their God with all their heart &c., and those that are not so disposed, let them love the Lord their God in another sense, even with their natural faculty and physical strength, or with what they have? If this is not the purport of the requirement, then it is but fair to conclude that it cannot be the spirit of obedience. To render this point clear, and to see that a command must be obeyed in the sense in which it is given, we may refer to the example of the young man that came to Christ with the inquiry, what good thing he should do to inherit eternal life? Christ told him to keep the commandments, in other words, to do what God had required. He replied, all these things have I kept from my youth up, what lack I yet? He had a *sense* in which he could keep and did keep the law. But unhappily it was not the *sense* in which the requirement was made, and therefore would not answer the purpose. The sense of the requirement is the only sense in which it can be done. What then is the requirement? Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart. Is there more than one sense in which men can love God with all their hearts? God commands all men everywhere to repent. Is there more than one sense in which men can truly repent? If not, can there be more than one sense in which they have power to do, or can be unable to do it? The requirement is

one and has but one sense; the spirit of obedience is one, must not power to do it be power to do it in its own sense and that only? And inability to do it must respect its own sense and no other.

But your doctrine asserts that God requires nothing of men which they have no power to do, while you admit that they are unable to do it in a sense. A sense of what? Of the Law? The Law has but one sense. A man is either able or unable to obey in that sense, and that only. If he is unable to obey in the sense of the Law, he is unable to obey in every sense, for the Law can be obeyed, I repeat, only in its own sense. Is it sense of inability? Is there more than one power or class of powers by which men can love God or their neighor? Does not the Law confine its requirements to specified powers and their exercise? And when the Law says, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c., does it mean that man shall love with his heart, love with his soul, love with his strength and love with his mind, or does it mean that he shall love with his heart, and with the other powers in conjunction with the heart and subordination to it? That is, that the soul, strength and mind shall be under the control and direction of the heart in the work of love? As the heart is the seat of affection, it would seem to be the only power which is able to love. We can hardly conceive of a person loving with his strength, or his mind, as a separate independent power. If the heart loves God, all the other powers love him too, in co-operation. If the heart is enmity, all the other powers follow in its train. If this be a correct view of the subject, and that it is who will deny, it would seem that the law contemplates but one sense in which it can be obeyed, and that sense depends on the affections of the heart. Now I ask you seriously, can there be two different senses in which the Moral Law can be obeyed; are there two different senses in which a man, a moral agent, may be unable to obey it? Can it be obeyed or disobeyed by the heart in one sense, and the process be reversed in spite of the heart, in another sense, by the other powers? Can the other powers proceed to love God in the absence of the heart or in resistance to it? What, love God with the strength or the mind only? How then can there be inability of heart and ability of another kind and in another sense? If this cannot be, then remember God has said, the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil. The carnal mind is enmity against God, is not subject to his law, neither indeed can be. If all this is so, then I desire to know how it is possible for a sinner, whose heart is not right in the sight

of God, and is therefore morally unable, as you admit, to be in possession of a power to do what God has required. In other words, I desire to know why your doctrine and your admission do not involve an absolute contradiction. Can we set aside the affections of the heart, and say a man has power to do, because he has some remnants of power, which, in connection with the affections, are requisite to do; and then admit the heart to its place, and say man is unable to do? By what authority do we attempt this dissection and permutation? For myself I must say I regard it as mere theological legerdemain. Be that as it may, it is evident that the sense, in which you admit that sinners are not able to do what God requires, is the only true sense, and this you admit the scriptures clearly teach. Consequently your doctrine is hypothesis in conflict with your own honest admission and the clear teachings of scripture. Nothing can be plainer than that sinners are either able or unable to do their duty. They cannot be both. If in any sense they are unable to do it, they cannot be in another sense able. Power is nothing but a name, where real inability exists. Which then shall we believe, your theological theory that God requires nothing that man cannot do, or the clear teaching of scripture that men are unable? Do you expect us to believe both?

You say there are two kinds of inability, natural and moral. This I admit. But then remember, these two kinds do not both lie within the range of moral agency. Natural inability has no relation to this subject, for when a man becomes a subject of this inability he ceases to be an accountable creature. A brute, an idiot, an insane person, have respectively natural inability, but their case lies outside of moral agency, as do some of your illustrations about controlling elements, lifting mountains and plucking the sun from his place. These things are formidable only in sound. Within the limits of moral agency, there is but just one kind of ability or inability. And as we are speaking of moral agents, it seems proper that we confine our attention to that which concerns them. I do not think it necessary to prove that men are not brutes, nor idiots, nor maniacs, any more than it is to prove that they are not required to control elements, or tempests.

I repeat it then, as a truth of vital importance, that inside of moral agency, there is but one kind of inability, as there is also but one kind of ability. And these both depend on the state or disposition of the heart.

But here your discourse meets me with a caveat. "You will observe," it says, "that I do not affirm that sinners have all power to do their duty, in other words that they are able in every sense to do what God requires." You are fairly entitled to the full value of this caution, if we can ascertain what that value is. Let us try. You remark, in explanation, that the inability which the scriptures clearly teach does not consist in the want of physical power, but in the want of disposition. By all power, then, I understand you to mean physical power with a right disposition. This you do not affirm. Therefore what you do affirm is, that sinners have "physical power" with a wrong disposition, and that, with this power thus situated, they can do all that God requires. That is to say, with "physical power," notwithstanding the opposition of a perverse heart, they can do all that God requires. And what does God require? "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." You affirm then that sinners with "physical power" can love God with all their heart, when their heart is full of enmity. Can you tell how this can be done? If you can, you can tell how sinners can see the kingdom of God without being born again, how a man can serve two masters, which would be giving great relief to many an impenitent sinner who desires to acquire this very secret. Did you ever see the man, do you expect ever to see one, that can love God with an heart of enmity, or with "physical powers" in connection with such an heart? What then becomes of your "physical power" to do what God requires? Where is it, what is it? Perhaps you will say that you do not affirm that the thing ever was done or ever will be, or can be, without a change of heart, and yet you are quite sure that "physical power" is able to do it. I reply, if "physical power" is able to do what never was done, never will or can be, then I despair of reaching it with logic or scripture, and must turn it over to range the undefined regions of mysticism. But you will ask me, is not physical power a constituent part of the power to do what God requires, and is it not good as far as it goes? I answer, certainly, but how far does it go? The form of godliness is good so so far as it goes, but the difficulty is, it does not go, and cannot go far enough to make godliness.

If you still insist on your distinction between power and all power, I ask, do you mean by power that which is adequate to the effect of doing what God requires? If so, then what need of all power? Enough is enough. If it does not mean what is adequate to the effect, but must have all power to help it out, then of

what use is it? Why not resort to all power at once, since you must do it at last or fail of the effect? And if power is inadequate to the effect, what is the amount of the doctrine of your discourse? If men have power to do what God requires, and yet, after all, cannot do it without more power, or all power, your doctrine will not give them much comfort. Inadequate power, in this case, is no power. Do you mean to say, as you appear to do in your discourse, that "physical power," though it cannot reach to the spirit and intent of divine requirement, yet serves to evince criminality, prevent excuses, and stop the mouths of objectors? I answer, there is no need of this device; moral agency does all this, and does it consistently. If it were otherwise, it would be questionable whether it is wise to attempt to stop the mouths of gainsayers with a figment. Do you still feel that this darling power is too valuable to be given up so, and insist that, if it is not all power, it is some power or something of power, if it is not an integer it is a fraction, and ought to pass for what it is worth? I profess to know something of numerical fractions, but I confess I do not feel at home in these theological fractions; they are a puzzle. I beg to be excused, and must be satisfied to know that a power that promises what it cannot perform, that claims to be a significant power, while it goes limping and halting on the broken crutches of moral inability, is no power to enable sinners to love God, or to prevent them from not doing it.

My third remark is, the arguments by which you attempt to support the doctrine extorted from your text, so far from sustaining, do not even reach the doctrine.

The character and government of God are all that you have represented them to be. But when you make the appeal to your hearers whether it would be right for God to require of men what they have no power to do, you leap over what you have just before admitted, viz: that sinners are in a sense unable to do what God requires, and that this inability is no excuse for sin, and no ground of complaint against the character or government of God. It seems then that the government of God is fully vindicated, while sinners are in a sense unable. The vindication then does not reach your doctrine, does not need it. Especially as it appears that there is but one sense in which man, as a moral agent, can be unable. Why go beyond the limits of moral agency to bring argument, when the supply within the limit is abundant? And if it were not, what aid can be derived from a nominal power, which, when applied to the case, is no power at all, and

does not reach the object. No one will affirm that the justice, truth or goodness of God require that he should make men willing to obey his commands. This would interfere with all correct views of responsible agency. Moral inability then is entirely consistent with the character and government of God. And this is the only inability which is claimed, or which can exist in the case of man as a moral agent. Any other sense of inability would destroy moral agency. But, moral inability is not a name or a shadow, it is a reality, a deep, entire and absolute inability. So it is represented and clearly taught in scripture. Is it not enough that God has made men moral agents, capable, if they are so disposed, to know and do his will, and left them to their free choice? Must he also ensure them against miscarriage or transgression? Must he give them power to do what he requires, whether they will or will not? Your doctrine says this has been done, but your argument from the character and government of God does not reach that length. It is not needed; it avails nothing.

I am aware that remarks, here and there in your discourse, would seem to imply that you consider a right disposition requisite to obedience, and that you occasionally advert to your text, which makes a willing mind the pivot of its statement. I should be very glad to be satisfied that such on the whole, is your belief. But there is your doctrine in unqualified terms, there are your efforts to explain away moral inability by another sense, there is your declaration that the desire or wish is not always, nor generally, included in the idea of power. From all this it does appear too evident to admit of a doubt, that you mean to make yourself responsible for the sentiment, that men can serve God acceptably without right affections, or even with those which are wrong. In respect to this sentiment, I would borrow your argument and ask, shall not the Judge of all the earth do right, is there unrighteousness with God? And I appeal to every rational person whether it would be right to take no account of disposition or motives, or to treat the willing and unwilling alike. If moral inability does not excuse sin, and is itself the very spirit and essence of all criminality, would it be right and just in God to overlook it?

Again, your argument from the nature of the requirements themselves is equally inert in the case. You say, and say well, that the commands of God are not grievous. But you seem to forget that the first and chief point of requirement in the Moral Law is, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and set yourself to the task of showing that the nature of the require-

ment is such that sinners can do what God requires with no right heart, that is with no love at all. Now I ask, is not this virtually changing the divine law, or presenting it under a partial and mutilated form? The law demands the heart or its affections, and you attempt to meet and satisfy that demand with something which you call power, but whatever it is, it is not love. If sinners can do all that God requires with a perverse and rebellious heart, then why does the law require the affections of the heart as the first thing? I need not follow an argument drawn from a mutilated law, and setting up a fragment as a sample of the nature of the law. You must be sensible, on reflection, of the unfairness and sophistry of such a course of argument. Take the law as it is, and tell me, does not God require of all men, sinners as well as others, the affections of their hearts? And can sinners, who withhold and alienate those affections, do all that God requires of them, with any other power or powers which they possess? These are plain, simple questions, which a child can answer, and the answer will leave your argument, from the nature of the law, far off from the track. Do you suppose that God cannot justly give a command without, at the same time, giving a disposition to obey it? Surely you do not. Why then allege inability as conflicting with the law, when that inability consists in the want of a right disposition, or the exercise of a wrong? Do you say there must be ability somehow, and as inability exists in one sense, there must be ability in another sense to preserve the balance of power? Why so? What is the difficulty? You admit that moral inability exists, that it is no excuse for sin, that God is righteous in his requirements nevertheless. What more do you want, why not let the subject rest just here? Can you expect to find a better conclusion? You say, and truly, that "God does not require us to love Him more than with all our heart." Neither, observe particularly, does it allow us to love Him less than with all the heart. How is it true then that men can love God with no right affection at all, or even with hearts of enmity?

The same reply, in substance, which has been given to your argument from the requirements of the law, is applicable to your argument from the invitations of the gospel. You request your hearers to look through the gospel and observe the manner in which God addresses his sinful creatures. You ask them to look at his invitations, his entreaties and expostulations. Then you inquire what sincerity can there be in these invitations and entreaties, if men have no more power to turn from sin to holiness

than to control elements! To this I reply, that the inquiry in this form is simply begging the question, because it assumes as true your side of the point in discussion, which is that physical powers have the same relation to moral as to physical effects? Power to control elements is physical power related to effects of its own nature. Inability in this case is simply a want of omnipotence, without any consideration of motives or disposition. Now to apply such a principle to moral relations and acts, in respect to which disposition or motive is the first and chief consideration, is mingling things which are essentially different, and tends to nothing but confusion. All this is foreign to the subject in hand. The question now before us is, not whether the sinner is the subject of natural inability which destroys moral agency; not whether he is a brute, or an idiot, or a lunatic; not whether he is bound with chains or confined within massive walls, so that he is hindered from doing as he desires; not whether he is able to control elements; nothing of all this, or the like, is asserted or believed. But the question is, can the sinner perform moral duty with physical power? or perform holy duties with an unholy heart? Has the sinner, being a moral agent and acting freely; has the sinner, being a sinner, a voluntary enemy to God, and impenitent in that enmity, at the same time power to love God and do all that he requires? In other words, can a man hate and love the same object; obey and disobey the same law at the same time?

In regard to sincerity in the invitations of the gospel, surely you do not suppose that sincerity in giving an invitation implies obligation to give a disposition to accept it. When you invite a person to your house, do you feel liable to the charge of insincerity if you do not procure his acceptance? When God invites sinners to the abundant provisions of the gospel, and they will not come, they are indeed so averse to the provision that, according to our Saviour's teaching, they cannot come, is God chargeable with insincerity? This plea is too stale to be seriously offered; as is also the plea that God makes men sin and then punishes them for being as he made them. God does not make men sin, they make themselves to sin; sin is their own, its consequences are of their own procuring, and if they choose to continue in it, and that choice is so strong that they cannot abandon their course, are they not justly liable to punishment? Would it be right in a moral ruler to pass over such obstinate criminality, which is all the more heinous and inexcusable on account of its strength and obstinacy?

My fourth remark is, that in the face of your doctrine, and of various passages of your discourse, to which I have already referred, you apparently, if not intentionally, concede the whole ground in question by saying, "My meaning is that God does not require of men what they might not do if rightly disposed. That they have all the power which is necessary to render them proper subjects of moral government, and to render their disobedience in every case utterly inexcusable." Indeed! Is this your meaning, and all you mean? Well, you ought to know your own meaning best. But one cannot help asking why you did not put the qualifying words, "if rightly disposed," into your doctrine as well as into this sentence? This is a material alteration. If this is your meaning, why assert that God requires nothing of men which they have no power to do, when you know that the most of men are not rightly disposed? Why the effort to convict others of error who believe with you that men are moral agents, proper subjects of moral government, and wholly inexcusable in sin? Is there not an occult meaning in this sentence, to this amount, that moral agency is not sufficient to render sinners, with their moral inability upon them, proper subjects of moral government, or inexcusable in sin, and that some other power is requisite to this purpose? That sinners have such a power, and therefore have power to do their duty, though not rightly disposed? I am inclined to the belief that such is your meaning from the fact, that in a note, you undertake to draw a parallel between moral agency and what you call natural ability, saying that one is taken for granted in the scriptures as well as the other. This note, which I shall examine in due time, seems to prove that, to your mind, moral agency and natural ability are not identical, and that the latter is an extra power which serves when moral agency fails. At all events, your explanation will not suffice to remove the impression from the minds of your readers that your discourse, as a whole, advocates the sentiment that sinners have power to do all that God requires of them, their moral inability notwithstanding. We must hold the discourse responsible for such an advocacy, and its author too, until he tells us in plain language, that his explanation is meant to be a retraction of his doctrine. And when he says this the controversy is ended.

In the mean time I say, that I admit obligation but deny ability. Do you ask, are not obligation and ability necessarily commensurate, and co-existent? I answer, not at all. Obligation is founded on moral agency; ability is founded on disposition. "A moral

agent," according to Pres. Edwards, "is a being that is capable of those actions that have a moral quality." Moral agency exists without respect to moral character or disposition. Obligation founded upon it, exists also irrespectively of disposition. A person is equally obligated to do his duty, whether he is or is not disposed to do it. Otherwise there could be no such thing as sin. If obligation depends on a disposition to obey, then sin, which implies a contrary disposition, would violate no obligation, and would be its own excuse. All the sinner would need to say would be, I am not disposed to obey, and his obligation, and consequently his sin, would cease. For where there is no obligation there can be no violation of it, and therefore no sin. This would lead to the absurdity that sin annihilates itself, or the more sin the less criminality. But, while obligation is founded on moral agency, ability to perform moral duty depends on the disposition, for the plain reason that moral duties require the affections of the heart, which spring from disposition. If men are required to love, and do in fact hate, it is evident that while they hate they they cannot love. Besides, the disposition may be so strong and so confirmed by habit, that the moral effect will as certainly and invariably follow, as a natural effect will follow a natural cause. This is what President Edwards calls "moral necessity." "That is the necessity of connexion and consequence which arises from such moral causes as the strength of inclination or motives, and the connexion there is between them and certain volitions and actions." Concerning this moral necessity, he says, "It may be as absolute as natural necessity. That is, the effect may be as perfectly connected with its moral cause, as a natural effect is with its natural cause." He adds, "When motives or previous biases are very strong, all will allow there is some difficulty in going against them. And if they were yet stronger the difficulty would be still greater. And therefore, if more still were added to their strength to a certain degree, it would make the difficulty so great that it would be wholly impossible to surmount it." Now whether we call this moral necessity or moral inability is immaterial. It is something that ensures its own effect with absolute certainty. Hence the language of scripture, in which sinners are said to be dead in sin, slaves to sin, prisoners to satan, as having destroyed themselves, and as being helpless in their moral ruin. They are not so in a sense that destroys moral agency, but they are so as to any power which they have for self-deliverance. Do you say this is moral inability? I say so too, but it is inabil-

ity nevertheless, and that, according to Edwards, as absolute as any which arises from natural causes. The scriptures teach this when they say "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the Leopard his spots, then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil." Jer. xiii. 23.

My next remark is, your reference to authorities in support of your theory of natural ability is unsatisfactory. You say in your preface that "the views presented in the following discourse are believed to be substantially the views which have been maintained by New England Calvinists generally since the days of President Edwards." Now I do not question that you believe this, but I am far from being satisfied that it is true in point of fact. You say that your views are set forth in the treatise of President Edwards on the will. I have been somewhat familiar with that treatise, and must say that I cannot find a trace of your doctrine in it. What I have already cited from that treatise shows that the author regarded moral inability, or what he calls moral necessity, absolute in its certain connexion with its effects, and invincible by any human or natural power. Now that he should turn so short a corner as to teach that sinners, who are the subjects of this inability, have power to do what God requires of them, is what I cannot believe.

As to the other names you have mentioned, I have not time to examine the sentiments connected with them particularly. But this I venture to say of them jointly and severally, if they were put to the task of explaining what they mean, they would say they mean moral agency, and nothing more. Indeed, leaving out a note and the prominence given to natural ability in the doctrine and general aspect of your discourse, I should conclude that moral agency is all that you intend to inculcate. For I observe that, occasionally, as if alarmed at the exposedness of your position, you fall back on moral agency, at least in appearance, and very quietly repose on the announcement that your meaning is, that men have power to do what is required of them, if rightly disposed. I am confident that such would be the result in the case of every author you name. Whether I am correct in this or not is of no great consequence. For I suppose we are to call no man master in such a sense as to copy his errors or his foibles. Great men are not always wise, and to adopt their defects would place us on par with the Chinese tailor, who put a patch in the elbow of a new coat because he found one in the elbow of an old coat given him as a pattern. Suppose you should go into a mer-

chant's store and ask for a pound of tea or a yard of cloth, and he should deal you out a quantity at random, saying, the most eminent dealers in New England consider this good weight and measure, and this the best method of dealing, though they do not all say as much publicly. Would you not regard this as a foible, and ask him, do you not keep balances and a yard stick? So it may be said to all second hand dealers in theology, "to the Law and to the Testimony, if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."

Since we are on the topic of human authority, it may not be amiss to take notice of a few facts as matter of history. The "confession of faith, owned and consented to by the Elders and Messengers of the churches (Congregational) in the Colony of Connecticut in New England, assembled by delegation at Saybrook, Sept. 9, 1708," is before me. In it is the following article, viz: "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so, as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto." This, if not adopted "from the days of President Edwards," was after his birth, and shows what was the sentiment of his immediate predecessors, and has remained to this day as the only public and common symbol of faith with the Congregational churches of Connecticut. The confession of faith of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, contains the same article, in the same words. The catechism put forth by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, in answer to the question, "Is any man able perfectly to keep the commandments of God," says, "No mere man since the fall is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God, but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed." So far as I am aware there has not been a confession of faith put forth by any Orthodox body of Christians, from the time of the Reformation to the present day, that has not contained, substantially, the same article. Luther, as you know, labored abundantly to inculcate the bondage of the will. It was one of his great themes. Of Calvin I need not speak, he speaks for himself. It has been the uniform belief of all sound Christians, that fallen man is impotent in the matter of his own recovery, impotent beyond the reach of all human power. We hear Arminians, since the Reformation, talking of gracious power, and self-determining power, and common grace; we hear Pelagians, before and since, talking of man's

native innocency, of a power of contrary choice and of a governing purpose, which yields to desperate efforts. But when, until your discourse appeared, have we heard any man or body of men, claiming to be sound in the faith, say, "God does not require of men what they have no power to do." No, brother, you will have to take heed to your doctrine or you will inevitably find yourself in bad company. It is true that expressions and terms have sometimes inadvertently been used, by sound divines, which, unexplained, would seem to favor such a sentiment. But in all such cases, so far as I know, when explanation has brought out the true meaning, it has been moral agency, and nothing more. And should this prove true in your own case, no one will rejoice more than myself. But as the case now is, your discourse will doubtless be hailed as an ally by all the antagonists of evangelical truth. And I venture to predict that it will be a rallying point for all those who trust in themselves that they are righteous and despise others. Thus, by means of your discourse, though unintentionally on your part, you "make the righteous sad, whom God hath not made sad, and strengthen the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life."

You must, I think, be under some misapprehension as to the kind of doctrines preached in connexion with the great revivals, near the close of the last and beginning of the present centuries. Human ability, so far as I know, was not one of those doctrines. And when at all alluded to, it was, I am confident, only in the sense of moral agency. It cannot surely have escaped your recollection, that the great and prominent doctrines of that interesting period, were the native and entire depravity of man, his consequent lost and dependent condition, the necessity of regeneration by the spirit of God, the doctrine of election, and sovereign grace, and the necessity of special divine power in every case of saving conversion. These were the doctrines which God was pleased to bless so extensively for the revival of his work and the glory of his name. And the churches in Connecticut would not have tolerated any preacher among them who was not clear and pointed on these subjects. This you know as well as I. And what but the suppression of these doctrines can account for the degeneracy of more recent revivals into scenes of animal excitement any stoney ground experience?

My next remark is, the doctrine of your discourse is in discordance with the language and teaching of the scriptures.

*It is a significant if not an overwhelming fact that not*

*one word or intimation of natural ability is found in the scriptures;* NOT ONE. *It is nowhere spoken of or alluded to in any form or manner.* In proof of this occurs the remarkable circumstance, that you could not find a text in the whole Bible on which to found your doctrine by legitimate relation. If there had been a passage to your purpose, doubtless you would have found it. Was it so, that you were under the necessity of pressing a text into service, and that the one selected would not teach natural ability until it had been eviscerated and put to torture under the screws of implication? It is marvelous that this circumstances did not stay your farther progress in the undertaking. But you say, in a note, that human ability is taken for granted in the scriptures, just as moral agency is, and that being understood, the inspired writers did not think it necessary to speak of it any more than they felt it necessary to speak in so many words of moral agency. That this is the best and the most you can say is doubtless true. But is it satisfactory? Is the analogy a just one? is it founded in truth? Moral agency, as a truth, pervades the scriptures from beginning to end. Man was created a moral agent, he was placed under command as a moral agent, he fell as a moral agent, he incurred forfeiture and penalty as a moral agent, he has the offers and invitations of the gospel as a moral agent; all the entreaties and expostulations of the scriptures are addressed to men as moral agents, and a future judgment day awaits them as moral agents. Every one knows and feels moral agency. It is matter of consciousness that man is a being capable of performing actions that have a moral quality good or bad, and is able to do his duty if so disposed. It was then unnecessary to give this truth a name on the inspired pages, as unnecessary as it would be for a painter, after having painted an house, to write under it, this is an house. But is it so with natural ability, in the case of fallen men, to do what is required of them, when not disposed? Is this ability a matter of consciousness or intuition? Is it anywhere implied or involved, or understood in a single passage of the scriptures? How can you say it is, when the scriptures say in plain terms, directly the opposite, when our Saviour most explicitly declares, "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him?" To cut this analogy of yours short and put it at rest, I have need only to call your attention to the fact that moral inability is clearly taught in the scriptures, which you admit. Now if this be clearly taught, and there is still another sense in which a sinner

is able to come to Christ of himself, would it not have been indispensable to a true statement, that that sense should have been as clearly taught as the other, and the proper distinction between them made plain? You appear to consider the distinction of great practical importance, and to think that preachers ought carefully to observe it and bring it out, lest they leave a wrong and hurtful impression. What then do you think of the preaching of Christ and his apostles, who observed no such distinction, nor even alluded to it? How can their practice be defended on the supposition that sinners, who are unable in one sense, are able in another? Surely if ever explanation is needed it is here. It is altogether incredible that the scriptures should have passed over human ability in silence, while they clearly teach human inability, if such ability were a reality. It would be impossible in that case to vindicate them from being accessory to error. They could not be a lamp to our feet and a light to our path, if they shed no light on this distinction of such "great practical importance," provided that it exist.

The conclusion then is that the silence of the scriptures respecting human ability is proof that no such ability has existence. They did not speak of it because there is nothing of the kind to be spoken of. And for us to speak of it and insist upon it is to be wise above what is written. This conclusion is confirmed by the freedom and fullness with which the scriptures speak of human inability. Christ repeated it distinctly in one of his public discourses, as you will see by referring to John vi. 44 and 65. He taught it to his disciples, as in themselves sinful men, and partaking of the common inability of a fallen nature. "Without me ye can do nothing." It was a doctrine in which he manifested great interest, and appears to have considered it of great practical importance. The same may be said of his apostles. They appear to have imbibed the spirit of their Lord and Master in this respect, and to have inculcated with the same freedom, the lost, helpless and dependent condition of fallen man. Paul speaks of sinners as without strength, Rom. v. 6; as dead in trespasses and sins, Eph. ii. 1. Of the natural man, in respect to the things of the spirit he says, "neither can he know them." But the time would fail for the repetition of all the passages of scripture in which the doctrine of human inability is taught in direct and explicit terms. Now, if I understand you, you do not approve of such preaching, and had you been present you would have felt it necessary to give a caution, lest the preaching of Christ and of

Paul should leave a wrong impression, and send away their hearers excusing themselves in sin. You would have felt solicitous lest Christ and his apostles should be driven from the field, and you would have invoked the Calvinists of New England to help them out with the doctrine of human ability. At least you would have endeavored to supplement their instructions with your discourse, showing that after all they say, "God does not require of men what they have no power to do." To place the matter in a just and true light, let us view your doctrine and that of the Saviour in juxtaposition and contrast.

"No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him."—*Jesus Christ.*

"God does not require of men what they have no power to do."—*Dr. Tyler.*

Now I appeal to your own candor and reverence for the authority of the scriptures, whether their teachings are not incompatible with your doctrine. Can it be a doctrine of the scriptures when they no where teach it? Are we warranted to make the scriptures responsible for our sentiments? If we begin to do it on the principle of implication and construction where shall we stop? Would it not lead to the presumption of certain recent transcendental theologians, who undertake to tell what the scriptures ought to mean and what God ought to do?

Before I dismiss this topic, permit me again to call your attention to the practice of Christ and his apostles, as an example to preachers of the gospel. It seems that they did not hesitate to preach human inability without any qualification. Their language is simple and absolute. "No man *can* come to me." "They that are in the flesh *cannot* please God." What better example can preachers have, and what safer course can they take than to follow it? True, men may refuse to hear this truth, and if left to themselves, certainly will. But the servants of Christ must preach his truth, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear. Ministers are not responsible for what their hearers do, but they are responsible for what they preach or keep back, of all the counsel of God. It may not be the way to gain popularity, secure a good living, or gather great numbers into the visible church. What then? What if numbers go away and walk no more with the ministers of Christ, just as numbers did when Christ himself preached the same truth, is that a sufficient reason why they should assume the awful responsibility of withholding the truth? If they cannot please men without displeasing

God, and being unfaithful to their trust, can they hesitate which to choose? The time will come, if it has not come already, when men will not endure sound doctrine, but will heap to themselves teachers having itching ears. What then? Must ministers preach unsound doctrine to tickle these itching ears? To all this you will of course say no. But remember, human inability, as taught by Christ and his apostles, is one of the first and chief subjects against which human pride revolts; as human ability is one of the first things to which human pride aspires.

As to success in the ministry, in edifying the body of Christ, or instrumentally converting sinners to God, in what way can the prospect be so fair as in preaching faithfully all the counsel of the Lord? Will the Spirit of all grace and truth be more likely to bless the smooth things of policy and flattery, than the truth, which he has moved holy men to speak and record? I say nothing of those imitative operations which are gotten up for the glorification of men, for these I know that you lightly esteem.

My last remark is, the doctrine of your discourse appears to be objectionable on account of its tendencies.

Among these tendencies, the first that offers itself to notice is that which leads to confusion and inconsistency. Of this tendency your discourse affords a pertinent example. In saying this I disclaim all personality. I am not speaking of yourself, but of the doctrine which you have advanced. The inherent difficulties of the doctrine, as they are developed in the Mosaic work of your discourse, I suppose are open to animadversion without giving just cause of offence.

Some of the discrepancies of your discourse, in respect to main positions, I have already brought to your notice. Suffer me now to present a few more examples of a more miscellaneous character.

At one time, as on page 23, and elsewhere, you labor to show that moral inability is no excuse for sin, that it affords no such ground, that it is chargeable with no such effect. At another time, as on page 17, you intimate that if this inability is preached there will be a ground of excuse or a wrong impression, that sinners will be induced to wait God's time, and conclude that they have nothing to do. It is true, you say, *without qualification* or *explanation*. But what need of these, if moral inability affords no ground of excuse?

To avoid contradiction here, your subject presses you to the absurdity of two senses of inability, when one of those senses

lies beyond the limits of moral agency, and when a moral agent can be unable only in one sense.

At one time, as on page 9, you admit that sinners are unable and that the Scriptures clearly teach it.

At another time, as on page 19, you teach that they are not unable in every sense, but in different senses they may be both unable and able. This, if it mean anything, means that inability is not inability, and that a sinner in respect to the same duty, under the same law, is both able and unable. Here, again, the only escape from contradiction is the absurdity of two senses.

On page 19, you ask, "may not a man be able to do what he has no inclination to?" Here your doctrine forces upon you the necessity of blending two different classes of relations which have no common bond, viz., natural and moral. A man can do outwardly and physically what he has no inclination to do. But can he do it morally, that is, according to the moral law? Your question avoids the true issue. Moreover, this question reminds me of your definition of power. Here, power is strength without inclination. There, power is strength with inclination.

At one time you speak of natural ability and moral agency as the same. At another time you speak of them as different. You say that obligation and dependence must be held in an even scale, as if natural ability were the foundation of obligation, and obligation could not be pressed on any other ground. Then you inquire if this is not a self-evident truth. And then again you attempt to argue this self-evident truth by various considerations. It is a new feature of logic to argue self-evident truths from those which are not. The common process is the reverse of this. At one time you consider the distinction which Edwards pointed out between natural and moral necessity and inability as auxiliary to your doctrine, while at another time you state your doctrine to be natural ability; as if the distinction between natural and moral inability were the same thing as natural ability. Thus you claim the authority of Edwards to your doctrine, when he has said nothing about it. At one time you say you believe that your views are substantially the views which have been maintained by New England Calvinists, generally, since the days of President Edwards. On the next page you state that there are those who make a distinction between natural and moral inability in reality, though not in form, as if there were any that were unwilling to make this distinction. But you add, "At the same time they hold that sinners possess all those intellectual and

moral powers which are essential to moral agency and which render them utterly inexcusable for disobeying one of God's commands," as if some did not hold this. Again you add, "but they object to calling the possession of these powers natural ability or ability of any kind. But this objection seems to ME groundless." Thus, as to anything that appears, after your flourish of trumpets about President Edwards and Calvinists of New England generally, it comes out that you are the only responsible author of the doctrine of natural ability. Some, you think, believed it who would not preach it, others objected to it altogether. But the power of progress has led you to put it in form and publicly to teach it. At one time you state your doctrine in an unqualified form, that men have natural ability. At another time, on page 17, you say, "If the preacher affirms, without qualification, that sinners are able to do whatever God requires, there is danger that he will be understood to mean, whether such be his intention or not, that they are able in every sense, that they really labor under no inability whatever." It seems that you were willing to incur the hazard, for whatever of qualification there may be in the discourse, it is so far removed from the doctrine as not to prevent its impression.

At one time you propose natural ability as a panacea to answer all questions and prevent all excuses. At another time, as on page 23, you raise a question which natural ability cannot answer without driving you to downright Arminianism. The question is, "Can the sinner change his inclination?" Your reply to this question is a departure from the doctrine of your discourse, by assuming that a sinful inclination is its own condemnation, the very essence of crime, and the more of it the more criminality, which is leaving your own ground and coming over to mine. I should like to hear you answer this question in accordance with your doctrine. Can a sinner change his inclination? If you say he can, then you are an Arminian. If you say he cannot, then what becomes of natural ability, the doctrine of your discourse, and what is it worth? This was an awkward question for you to raise, as it shows at a glance the utter inanity of your doctrine when brought to the merits of the subject.

Now I say that a doctrine, which puts its advocate to such shifts, must have constitutional infirmity. And if it has wrought such confusion in your mind, what will it not do in the minds of your hearers and readers?

Another tendency of this doctrine, which militates against it,

is that which looks towards those sentiments that constitute an acknowledged shipwreck of the faith.

Its proclivity to the Pelagian and Arminian heresies, has been observed, and has, as you admit, excited fears, in some quarters, that have been expressed. And how have those fears been allayed? By calling up the name of President Edwards, when, so far as appears, he had no paternity in respect to this doctrine. He made use, indeed, of the distinction between natural and moral inability. But how that distinction helps natural ability does not appear. There is such a family likeness between the power of contrary choice, self-determining power, and natural ability, that no one can be esteemed captious or suspicious if he should express his fears of a relationship. If a man embraces the doctrine of your discourse, he will find the descent easy and not very protracted to kindred and fatal errors. "Facilis descensus Averni." Besides, your doctrine appears to be in alarming proximity to Perfectionism. God requires of all men that they be perfect as their Father which is in heaven is perfect. And your doctrine affirms that "God does not require of men what they have no power to do." Men, therefore, have power to be perfect, or to do what perfection implies. And if they have the power, who can say that they will not exercise it? Indeed, who can say that they have not exercised it already? And if you carry out the doctrine of your discourse, it must land you on the dreary coasts of Perfectionism, "a land of darkness as darkness itself, and of the shadow of death without any order, and where the light is as darkness."

Again, the tendency of the doctrine of your discourse is to cherish a spirit of self-confidence and independence. You insist on the necessity of teaching sinners their dependence on the grace of God, without which they never will repent. And how do you propose to do this? By inculcating their moral inability, and then counteracting it by assuring them that they have power to do all that God requires? Will this doctrine make them feel their dependence? It seems to me it will have just the opposite effect. The result will be much the same as if you shut a man up in prison, and put a key in his pocket with which he could open the gate and come out when he pleases. Will he be likely to feel his dependence while he has that key? The power which your doctrine puts in the sinners hands is his key, and I see not why he should feel dependent while he has it. How was it with Felix? He was a believer in the doctrine of your discourse, if

we may judge from his practice. He thought he had power to do all that God required, or he would never have lost the opportunity which he had. And this doctrine was the cause of his eternal ruin. Paul did not indeed preach this doctrine to him, for he never preached it, but sinful inclination and the great Deceiver had taught it to him, he followed it and was lost. This idea of natural ability is the principal cause of that procrastination which generally and fatally prevails among men. If God requires nothing of men that they have no power to do, why should they not feel independent. They are so in fact, and why should they not enjoy it? Indeed, if I believed in the doctrine of your discourse, dependence would be the last thing I should ever think of preaching to men, or rather it is what I should never think of preaching at all. Independence is what all men, in a natural state desire. For this they earnestly contend as for a birthright. This feeling makes them restive and turbulent under all intimations of divine sovereignity. Their supposed natural ability clashes in their feelings with the divine prerogatives, and they are prompted by a conceit of natural ability to regard the government of God as partial and unjust. This doctrine of natural ability cherishes the spirit of independence in one of two ways; either by raising the conceit that the power has wrought out its results, in which case it ends in dead formality, or by a confidence that it will be exercised in due season.—The young man that came to Christ the Pharisee, and the church at Laodicea are examples of the former method, and of the latter method, we have innumerable examples in the multitudes that "resolve, rëresolve and die the same." These all mistake their own state, they flatter themselves, if not flattered by their ministers, they trust in their natural ability, it is their righteousness; but it proves to be a fatal delusion, that hides from them the truth that they are wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked. You see then that the examples of the influence of this doctrine do not recommend it to our belief or practice. It is a doctrine that exalts man against God, and strengthens in sinners the spirit of pride and rebellion. This, of course, is not the purpose for which you preach it, you wish to make men sensible of obligation; but they turn it to the use of their own perverse feelings.

Again, the doctrine of your discourse tends to shield impenitence and unbelief.

"Without conviction of sin there can be no repentance for sin, and consequently no pardon nor salvation." "But what is con-

viction?" You say, "it is a sense of guilt." I say it is more, it is a sense of inexcusable and remediless guilt, that is remediless by any power which the sinner possesses. That "the heart is *desperately* wicked." But take it in your sense, conviction is guilt not only proved but felt, a *sense* of guilt. Now is the sinner likely to feel his guilt, and feel concerned about it while you tell him he has power to do all that God requires? The idea of this power will tend to blind him to his guilt, to quiet his conscience and make him feel that the remedy is in his own hands. You have shown him that he is in the prison, but then you have given him a key with which he can unlock the door and come out when he pleases. This will tend to weaken his sense of guilt. He will be ready to say to himself, what do I care for the guilt, so long as I have power to do all that God requires? My case cannot be so bad as many would have me believe. For, say what they will about native depravity and actual sin or the necessity of regeneration, I am on safe ground, for I have power, and I intend to use it when the necessity arises. Tell him of the wickedness of his heart, and that he is morally unable, and he will turn upon you and say, what of that? I have power in another sense to do all that God requires. I do not say that you would intentionally authorize or encourage such feelings, I know you would not, but I do say, most if not all impenitent sinners will make this use of your doctrine. They will consider the power of which you speak as a remnant of natural goodness, surviving the fall, and if not meritorious in itself, it is a power to acquire merit, as it must be, if it is power to do all that God requires.

Permit me to refer you to the case of those pricked in the heart at the day of Pentecost, who said, "men and brethren what shall we do?" What was their state of mind, what their conviction? Was it a mere sense of guilt, or was it also a sense of their helplessness in that guilt? It seems they knew of nothing they could do, they were at a stand, their question implies a strong negation, there is nothing we can do. Now if they, in another sense had power to do all that was required of them, would they not have known it, and would it not have prevented their coming to this point of despair as to their own resources? Or supposing Peter had believed your doctrine, and instead of charging home moral inability without qualification or reserve, had, through fear of furnishing them with an excuse, said, you have power to do all that God requires, would his preaching probably have been of any saving effect? The same is true of the jailor of Phillippi, and true of every case

of saving conversion. I should have no confidence in an experience founded on any state of feeling short of entire abandonment of all hope from natural powers, or any arm of flesh, and I presume you would say the same. But why such abandonment if sinners have natural ability? If genuine experience leads to such abandonment, it must be because natural ability has no existence. Your doctrine is then contrary to the testimony of all true experience. It is no less inconsistent with the statements of Scripture respecting the natural state of fallen man. Gen. vi. 5. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thought of his heart was only evil continually." Isaiah i. 5, 6. "The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores, they have not been cleansed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment." Jer. xvii. 9. "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who *can* know it?" Eph. iv. 18, 19. "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart, who being past feeling have given themselves over to work all uncleaness with greediness."—Where is your power to do all that God requires amidst this total wreck of human nature?

I might shew that your doctrine is equally at variance with the Scriptural account of regeneration. But I will tax your patience with only one suggestion more. Your doctrine leaves no place for Christ, and therefore fosters unbelief. Christ came to seek and save that which was lost. But is he lost that has power to do what God requires? The whole need not a physician but they that are sick. Is he sick who has power to do all that God requires? Christ came to be eyes to the blind, ears to the deaf, feet to the lame, life to the dead, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound. But how is the man blind, deaf, lame, bound or dead, who has power to do all that God requires of him? And if natural ability is thus powerful what need of Christ?

Now Sir, as you express deep concern lest the doctrine of inability should leave a wrong impression, and endanger the souls of men, let me ask you, respectfully, as my elder brother, is there no danger that sinners will be quieted in self-confidence and false peace; no danger that they will entertain partial and superficial views of their sin, as to its nature and extent; no danger that they will be encouraged in presumption and unbelief; and that

their souls will perish in this delusion? To me it appears certain, that if they be not driven from this false refuge of natural ability, there is no hope of their salvation. Is it not safe to preach as Christ and his apostles preached? Did they not know what is good and profitable for men and what their case requires? Surely, the man that condemns the preaching that distinctly recognizes the impotency of sinners, either is not aware of the sweep of his sentence, or he must be destitute of reverence for the highest authority.

As to excuses, the doctrine of human inability furnishes no ground for them, as you repeatedly affirm. It is the sinners crime and the very essence of his criminality. No man who makes an excuse on this ground, believes in its validity. Every man knows that his inability is his sin, and the source of all his criminality, he is conscious of this, and if he will make an excuse of it, he will make an excuse of any truth. The fault is not in the preaching, but in the perversity of the sinners heart. The gospel will to some prove a savor of death unto death in spite of all we can say or do. But observe the decided advantage which the doctrine of human inability gives in treating the case of sinners. It prepares the way to bring home to them at once the whole truth in respect to their condition and prospects, and the more freely to direct them to Christ; it strips them of their filthy garments, preparatory to their receiving the robe of Christ's righteousness; it lays them at the feet of sovereign grace, that they may the more readily submit, and learn the new song of redeeming love. If they object, or excuse themselves on the ground of inability, show them what that inability is, and they will find no comfort in it, unless they are determined to be excused, and then, any thing will answer their purpose, true or false. If they still plead their want of strength, tell them, as did a venerated Father of by-gone days, "you need no strength to fall down." This, it seems to me, is a much more consistent and scriptural mode of treatment, than to administer an anodyne of natural ability, and thus turn the sinners confidence from Christ to himself.

For the reasons I have stated I cannot say Amen to your discourse, but feel in duty bound to enter my protest against it. I fear it will do much harm, especially to those that seek countenance in their opposition to the truth. They are the persons who will receive the greatest injury. The established believer, who is conversant with his Bible, will be protected by its panoply; but

the caviler, the self-righteous, the loose and superficial thinker, and, above all, those who are ready to send a message after Christ, saying, we *will not* have this man to rule over us, will be likely to take courage from the doctrine of your discourse, and to gather up their natural ability and put it to service in opposition to the Cross of Christ.

In conclusion, allow me to say, I regret the necessity which I have felt of remarking on your discourse. It was thrown so directly in my path, that I did not see how I could, consistently with duty, be silent. If I have written anything unkind or unduly severe, I ask pardon. If I have, in any respect, misrepresented your views, it is only because they have been misapprehended. And be assured, Dear Sir, that I have felt no desire to impeach or disparage your mental or moral integrity. I do not question the rectitude of your motives. You have, for aught I know, done as well as any man could do in the case. The difficulties are inherent in the subject. The trouble is, you have undertaken to do what could not be done. It is simply a mistake. For I am very sure that no man, nor even Angel, could have taken the position which you appear to have taken, and have maintained it in consistency with himself or the Scriptures.

Yours very truly, &c.,

JOSEPH HARVEY.

A

# LETTER

TO

# The Rev. Joseph Harvey, D. D.,

IN REPLY TO

HIS STRICTURES ON A SERMON OF THE AUTHOR,

ENTITLED

"A DISCOURSE ON HUMAN ABILITY AND INABILITY."

---

BY

REV. BENNET TYLER, D. D.,

PRESIDENT AND PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN THE THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF CONNECTICUT.

---

Hartford:

PRESS OF CASE, TIFFANY AND COMPANY.

M.DCCC.LV.

# LETTER.

Rev. Dr. HARVEY:

Dear Sir:—I have received your printed letter in reply to my "Discourse on Human Ability and Inability." The perusal of it has suggested a few thoughts, which I beg leave to submit to your consideration.

You say in the close of your letter, "If I have, in any respect, misrepresented your views, it is only because they have been misapprehended." I shall, of course, attribute your misrepresentations to no other cause. That they are many and great, you will yourself perceive, when your misapprehensions shall have been corrected.

The great mistake into which you have fallen, and that which pervades your whole pamphlet, and gives to it all the plausibility which it possesses, relates to the meaning which I attach to the words *power* and *ability*, when applied to unrenewed men. Throughout your letter you represent me as meaning by these terms, something entirely different from what I do mean. What then do I mean by the sinner's natural ability to obey God? I mean by it, that and that only, which constitutes the basis of his obligation to obey. All God's rational creatures possess certain intellectual and moral powers, which are essential to moral agency and accountability. The possession of these powers, renders them capable of moral action, and the proper subjects of commands and threatenings, rewards and punishments. And this is what I mean by the natural ability which I ascribe to sinners. That such is my meaning, I supposed I had made sufficiently plain.

In the preface to my sermon I said, "There are those who make this distinction in reality, though not in form. They hold that the inability ascribed to sinners in the Scriptures, is altogether of the moral kind, and that it consists in a wicked heart, or perverse inclination. At the same time they hold, that *sinners possess all those intellectual and moral powers which are essential to moral agency, and which render them utterly inexcusable for disobeying one of God's commands.* But they object to calling these powers natural ability, or ability of any kind. BUT THIS OBJECTION APPEARS TO ME TO BE GROUNDLESS." Have I not here indicated with sufficient clearness, what I understand by the sinner's natural ability?

Again. I thus explained the doctrine of my sermon. "When I say, therefore, that God does not require of men what they have no power to do, my meaning is, that all his commands are limited by the faculties which he has given them—that he does not require of them what they might not do, were they rightly disposed—that they have all the power which is necessary to render them proper subjects of moral government, and to render their disobedience, in every instance, utterly inexcusable."

Is not this language plain and explicit? And is it not in perfect accordance with the statement in the preface to my sermon, to which I have just referred? Permit me also to ask, whether there is anything in this statement which is not true? Is it not true, that God's commands to his creatures, are limited by the faculties which he has given them? Does he require them to exercise, or to employ in his service, faculties which they do not possess? Is there anything but a wrong disposition to prevent any of his rational creatures from obeying his commands? And is it not true, that sinners have all the power which is necessary to render them proper subjects of moral government, and which is necessary to render their disobedience, in every instance, utterly inexcusable? Here then is an explicit statement of what I mean by the doctrine of my discourse, and by the ability which I ascribe to sinners.

This passage did not escape your notice. After quoting the latter part of it, you exclaim in astonishment, "Indeed! Is this your meaning?" Certainly it is; and why are you so astonished? But you ask again, is this "all you mean?" Certainly

it is, all I mean. And I beg to know what else you could suppose me to mean? In what one passage have I intimated that I mean anything more? You have not adduced any such passage, and I venture to say that you can not do it. And yet you insist that this is not all that I mean—that I ascribe to the sinner a natural ability over and above the essential faculties of a moral agent, and entirely distinct from them. But you will not pretend that I have said any such thing; and if you really think that I do hold to such a power, will you tell me what you suppose it to be?

You will not certainly charge me with holding the Arminian notion of a self-determining power in the will, or the power of contrary choice. You will not charge me with denying the doctrine of total depravity, and of maintaining that there is some goodness in the sinner's heart, and of course some moral ability to overcome his moral inability; for you know that I hold to the sinner's absolute moral inability and consequent dependence on divine grace, as fully as you do. You will not charge me with ascribing to unrenewed men a gracious ability, by which they are enabled to work out their own salvation; for I have distinctly repudiated that doctrine in the sermon. You will not charge me with holding to the suspension of the selfish principle in the sinner's heart, previous to regeneration; for you well know my views on that subject.

What then is it which you charge me with holding? And why is it that in the face of my explicit declarations, you insist that I do ascribe to sinners a natural ability over and above what is implied in the essential faculties of a moral agent? You seem, at times, to be almost convinced that your charge is unjust. You say, p. 18, in regard to those New England ministers who have ascribed to sinners natural power to do their duty, that "if they were put to the task of explaining what they mean, they would say they mean moral agency and nothing more;" and then add, "Indeed, leaving out a note, and the prominence given to natural ability in the doctrine and general aspect of your discourse, I should conclude that moral agency is all that you intended to inculcate."

Here then are your reasons for believing that I must mean something more than moral agency. They are two. First, the

note. "This note," you say, "seems to prove, that to your mind, moral agency and natural ability are not identical, and that the latter is an extra power which serves when moral agency fails."

My dear sir, I beg that you will look at that note again. I must think that you could not have written the above, with the book before you, but must have written from memory, after you had forgotten what you had read. The note is on the seventeenth page of the sermon, and reads thus:

"It may be said that the Scriptures assert, without qualification, the sinner's inability, and nowhere assert that he has ability to do his duty. But does not God virtually assert the ability for which we contend, in every command, in every invitation, and in every threatening, which is addressed to sinners? It is admitted that if mankind did not possess all the faculties which are essential to moral agency, they would not be responsible. But the Scriptures nowhere assert that men are moral agents, or that they possess the faculties which are essential to moral agency. But this, we are told, is not necessary, because the possession of these faculties is taken for granted and implied in every divine command. If then, *as we maintain, the possession of these faculties constitutes what we call natural ability*, this ability is taken for granted and implied in every divine command."

Have I here affirmed that "moral agency and natural ability are not identical, and that the latter is an extra power which serves when moral agency fails?" Have I not affirmed directly the contrary? You will perceive that my statement here perfectly corresponds with that in the preface to my sermon, and also with the explanation of my doctrine on page 10. I know not how I could have made my meaning plainer than I have in these passages. You say, page 16, that I ought to know my own meaning best. I think so too. Why then do you claim to know it better than I do? And what is your proof that my meaning is different from what I have declared it to be? One part of it is derived from the note to which we have just attended. We have seen what kind of proof this turns out to be. Your witness here, instead of testifying in your favor, has testified point blank against you. The remaining part of your proof

is derived from "the prominence given to natural ability in the doctrine and general aspect of the discourse." Leaving this out, and the note above mentioned, you say, "I should conclude that moral agency is all that you intend to inculcate." But how does the prominence which I have given to natural ability, go to show what I mean by natural ability? And especially how does it go to prove that I must mean by it, what I have declared I do not mean? Suppose I were to tell you that I heard a sermon in which the doctrine of election was very prominent. You ask me what did the preacher mean by the doctrine of election? Did he take the Calvinistic or the Arminian view? Suppose I should reply, as he explained the doctrine, it was the Calvinistic view; but from the prominence which he gave to the doctrine, I conclude he meant to take the Arminian view. Would this be good reasoning? But I need say no more on this point.

You inform me on page 20, that if it shall be proved to be true, that I mean by natural ability, moral agency and nothing more, no one will rejoice more than yourself. That this is proved to be true, I trust you are now convinced. You will of course greatly rejoice. I am sorry that you should have been made sad, by a misapprehension of my meaning. As this misapprehension is now corrected, you will readily perceive that a large part of your letter is made up of misrepresentations. I do not deem it necessary to point out these misrepresentations, as they must be obvious to every reader after having perused the foregoing pages.

It is now perfectly apparent, that all the difference between us on this subject, is merely verbal. I believe as fully as you do, the absolute moral inability of the sinner, and all the doctrines which that inability implies. And you believe as fully as I do, that sinners possess those intellectual and moral powers which I call natural ability. The only question between us, therefore, relates to the proper use of terms. Is it proper to call the possession of those faculties which render man a moral and accountable being, natural ability, or ability of any kind? Or ought we to say that sinners have no ability whatever to obey God's commands? On this point good men have differed without any difference in their doctrinal views, and without any

want of confidence in each other's soundness in the faith. And why may it not be so with you and me? I have no sympathy with those who believe in a self-determining power in the will, or in the power of contrary choice; nor with those who ascribe to sinners a gracious ability, or any ability which implies a right disposition, or a disposition to get a right disposition, or anything which is inconsistent with the most absolute moral inability. I fully believe that sinners are dead in trespasses and sins; that they are morally helpless, and absolutely dependent on the grace of God for salvation. This I believe and teach, and have always believed and taught, ever since I was licensed to preach the gospel. At the same time, I believe that sinners are under perfect obligation to obey every divine command, and that for every act of disobedience, they are justly condemned. This you believe as fully as I do. There is, of course, something which constitutes the basis of the sinner's obligation, and which clearly shows that he is a proper subject of commands and threatenings. This is what I call natural ability. And what I say is this, I cannot see how a sinner can be under obligation to do what he is absolutely and in every sense unable to do. But you say that moral agency is the true basis of obligation, and that all which is necessary to convince sinners of their obligation, is to show them that they are moral agents. But the question now is, whether moral agency does not imply some sort of ability, and whether if we tell sinners that they are moral agents, and at the same time tell them that they have no ability whatever to obey God, we do not contradict ourselves, or at least make the impression that moral agency is not a complete basis of moral obligation.

It is common for us to speak of man's natural abilities, meaning by the phraseology, the powers of his mind. And if men do possess faculties which render them capable of moral action, and proper subjects of commands and threatenings, why is it not proper to say that they are capable of obedience or disobedience? Is the possession of these faculties to be set down for nothing, toward qualifying them for obeying God's commands? It is true they will not secure obedience without a right disposition. But they are as indispensable to obedience as a right disposition. A man can no more obey without these faculties,

than he can obey without a good heart. Suppose a man to possess a good heart: if he becomes an idiot or a lunatic, he at once loses all ability to obey. If, then, it is proper to call a good heart, moral ability, and the want of it moral inability, why is it not proper to call the possession of these faculties, natural ability, and the want of them, natural inability? That it is so, has been the opinion of the great body of New England divines for more than a century past; and they have felt that by means of this distinction, they have been able to exhibit the sinner's obligations in connection with the doctrines of grace, in a more clear and convincing manner than they otherwise could. And so the subject has appeared to me. How a man can be under obligation to do what he has no sort of ability to do, it is certainly very difficult for me to see. Nor am I the only one to whom it thus appears. Dr. Smalley says, "I presume there are few but that are sensible of some difficulty in reconciling God's requiring natural impossibilities with any notions we have of justice." Notice also the remark of the late Dr. Porter, of Andover, quoted in the preface to my sermon. "Tell impenitent sinners that they have *no sort of power* to repent, while in the same breath you exhort them to repentance on pain of eternal misery, and if they have capacity enough to understand your meaning, they pronounce it utterly absurd. Give them what you call conclusive arguments from Scripture, and from metaphysics; they may be confounded perhaps, but not convinced. And why should it be strange if they feel indignant, when gravely addressed on the most weighty of all subjects, in a strain that would be mockery and nonsense, if applied to any human concern besides religion?"

In regard to all the external forms of duty, it is perfectly plain that no man can be justly required to do what he has *no* ability to do. If a man should be required to give in charity what he does not possess; if a child should be required to do what he has not strength to perform; if a man should be required to labor in the field, when he is confined to his bed by sickness, or if any man should be commanded to do any outward action which he has no ability to do, the command would be obviously unjust. This I presume you will not deny. Yet in all these cases, there may be a moral inability as absolute as in any case whatever.

The miser may be as unable to contribute liberally to a benevolent object, as the sinner is to repent—and not only to contribute with right motives, but to contribute at all. If he is so obstinately determined that he will not give, that no motives can persuade him to do it, he is morally unable; and yet you will not say that he has no ability to give. And so in regard to all the external forms of duty. In all these cases, therefore, the distinction between natural and moral inability most obviously exists. And while natural inability always excuses from blame, moral inability never excuses. And why is it not proper to apply this distinction to all cases of duty? There certainly seems to be an incongruity in maintaining that God may justly require of men in some cases, what they have no sort of ability to do, while it is admitted that in other cases, such a requirement would be obviously unjust. If you should exhort a strong athletic man to labor for the support of himself and family, and he should say, I have no disposition to labor, I have such a propensity to idleness that I can not labor; would you tell him, I know it is so; I know you have no ability to labor; but still it is your duty to labor, and if you do not, you will fall under the displeasure of God? You certainly would not expect in this way to convince him of his duty. Why then should you tell the sinner, when he says, I can not repent, I know you can not, you have no ability to repent, not the least in the world. Those who tell you that you have some sort of ability, are attempting to delude you with a most dangerous error. But what shall I do? says the sinner. You must repent. But you tell me I can not—that I have not any ability whatever. I know it, and it is true. But you must repent or perish. And am I to understand you that my Maker requires me, on penalty of eternal death, to do what is absolutely, and in every sense, impossible? Certainly he does. Now do you really think that this is the best way to commend yourself to the consciences of sinners, and to show them the inexcusable guilt of their impenitence? I can not think so.

On page 10, you admit that there are two kinds of inability, natural and moral; but you say, that "natural inability has no relation to this subject; for when a man becomes a subject of this inability, he ceases to be an accountable creature." If, then,

sinners have not ceased to be accountable creatures, they are not the subjects of natural inability. Consequently they are not in every sense unable to do their duty. To use the language of Dr. Woods, "they have some kind of ability."

But you say, you do not "think it necessary to prove that men are not brutes, or idiots, or maniacs." Neither do I. But I do think it necessary to show, that they are not *as unable* to repent, as brutes and idiots and maniacs, as they certainly are, if they have no ability at all. According to your view of the subject, why would it not be proper to address sinners in this manner? My impenitent hearers, although God commands you to repent, and threatens to punish you eternally if you do not obey the command, yet you have no power of any kind whatever to repent. You have no more ability to repent than a stock or a stone. You are no more able to repent than you are to lift a mountain or to create a world. Now I have no doubt that you would be shocked to hear a preacher address his congregation in this manner. Yet if sinners have no ability to repent, you can not deny that these declarations are perfectly true. Indeed, you can not conceive of anything which they are more unable to do, than they are to repent.

You will now understand why I still adhere to that use of terms, which has been common among sound New England divines. Some whose theological views perfectly accord with my own, may be more cautious than I am in the use of these terms, lest they should be suspected of Pelagian and Arminian tendencies. But surely such men as Edwards, and Bellamy, and Spring, and Smalley, and Griffin, and Porter, and their illustrious compeers, never fell under any such suspicions; nor need those who at the present day adopt their views, entertain any fears on this point, if they are careful to explain their language, and are known to believe all the doctrines of grace. Permit me to add, I do not think it just to the character of the best men who ever occupied the pulpits of New England, to intimate that the language in which they expressed their theological views, was such as necessarily teaches great and dangerous errors.

I am inclined to think there are but few ministers who adopt your views, that make them very prominent in their preaching; or that often directly say to sinners, you have no ability what-

ever to repent. I presume that when sinners plead their inability in justification of their impenitence, they kindly explain the matter to them, and attempt to show them that they labor under no inability which furnishes them with the least excuse. And this is what I would do, and what sound New England ministers have been in the habit of doing. So that these two classes of ministers have been, for the most part, substantially agreed, not only in their doctrinal views, but in their practical application of them. "*Let brotherly love continue.*"

I said in the preface to my sermon, "The views presented in the following discourse, are believed to be substantially the views which have been maintained by New England Calvinists generally, since the days of President Edwards." I did not expect that the truth of this declaration would be called in question; for if there is any fact in the ecclesiastical history of New England, which is capable of being established by the most conclusive evidence, I believe this to be one. My limits will not permit me to go into an extended examination of authorities. But this will not be necessary to satisfy a reasonable mind.

In regard to Edwards himself—You admit that he made the distinction between natural and moral inability. You will also admit, that this distinction was not made by Calvinists before his day. And what was his object in making it? It was that he might meet more effectually than his predecessors had done, the objections of Pelagians, Arminians and Socinians. The Calvinists were constantly pressed with the objection, that if God requires of men what they have no ability to do, his commands can not be just. In reply to this objection, Edwards maintained, that sinners are not unable, in every sense, to do their duty—that while they labor under a moral inability, they do not labor under a natural inability. He maintained, moreover, that a moral inability, in no case whatever, implies the total want of all ability. But let him speak for himself.

After explaining the distinction between natural and moral inability, he says: "It must be observed concerning moral inability in each kind of it, that the word inability is used in a sense very diverse from its original import. The word signifies only a natural inability, in the proper use of it, and is applied to such cases only wherein a present will or inclination to the

thing with respect to which a person is said to be unable, is supposable. It can't be truly said, according to the ordinary use of language, that a malicious man, let him be never so malicious, can't hold his hand from striking, or that he is not able to show his neighbor kindness; or that a drunkard, let his appetite be never so strong, can't keep the cup from his mouth. In the strictest propriety of speech, a man has a thing in his power, if he has it in his choice, or at his election; and a man can't be truly said to be unable to do a thing, when he can do it if he will. 'Tis improperly said, that a man can't perform those external actions which are dependent on the act of the will, and which would be easily performed if the act of the will were present. And if it be improperly said that he can not perform those external voluntary actions which depend on the will, *'tis in some respect more improperly said, that he is unable to exert the acts of the will themselves; because it is more evidently false, with respect to these, that he can't if he will, for to say so, is a downright contradiction.* It is to say that he *can't* will, if he *does* will. And in this case, not only is it true that it is easy for a man to do the thing if he will, but the very willing is the doing; when once he has willed, the thing is performed. THEREFORE, IN THESE THINGS, TO ASCRIBE A NON-PERFORMANCE TO THE WANT OF POWER OR ABILITY, IS NOT JUST, BECAUSE THE THING WANTING IS NOT A BEING ABLE, BUT A BEING WILLING. There are faculties of mind, and capacity of nature, and everything else sufficient, but a disposition. Nothing is wanting but a will."

Now my dear sir, just look at this language of Edwards, and tell me if he maintained that sinners have *no ability* to do their duty. So far from it, he most explicitly teaches, that when a man is prevented from doing a thing by nothing but the want of a disposition, whether it be an external action, or an act of the will itself, it is never proper to say that he has no ability to do it. Consequently he did maintain that since sinners have "faculties of mind, and capacity of nature, and everything sufficient" to enable them to repent, "but a disposition," it is not proper to say that they have no ability to repent.

Dr. Bellamy, in his "True Religion Delineated," says, "We ought to love God in a measure exactly proportionable to the

largeness of our natural powers and faculties." Again—"All that perfection which God requires of any of his creatures, is a measure of knowledge and love bearing an exact proportion to their *natural* abilities." Again—"Thus we see, that as to a *natural capacity*, all mankind are *capable* of perfect conformity to God's law, which requires us only to love God with all our hearts; and that all our inability arises merely from the bad temper of our hearts, and our want of a good disposition; and that therefore we are to blame and altogether inexcusable. Our impotency, in one word, is not *natural* but *moral*, and, therefore, instead of extenuating, does magnify and enhance our fault."

I might quote whole pages from the discourses of Dr. Smalley on this subject, from which it would appear that he maintained the same views which are set forth in my sermon. But as his views are so generally known, I will only refer you and the reader, to the short passage already quoted, and to the two passages which will be found in the preface to my discourse.

Dr. Samuel Spring, in his "Moral Disquisitions," says, page 7, "Nor is the question in debate, whether sinners have natural ability to repent; *for I hold that they have natural ability to repent*, as well as to perform actions which are destitute of repentance."

Dr. Catlin, in his "Compendium of the System of Divine Truth," says, "The necessity of regeneration, does not arise, as some suppose, from a *natural inability* to embrace the offers of the gospel. The Scriptures admit of no such inability to perform any one of the divine commands. . . . . Surely there can be no natural inability, no insuperable difficulty, in sinners' casting away their transgressions, and becoming reconciled in heart to the way of salvation by Jesus Christ. All the difficulty, in this case, exists only in the heart or will; and it does not in the least degree, impair the natural powers and faculties of the mind."

Let me request you to look into Dr. Griffin's Park street Lectures, and read his sermon entitled the "Plea of inability considered." He says, "The plea is false. It is not true that God requires of sinners more than they are able to perform. It is not true that they can not love God and submit to him. They have ample power, and nothing prevents but their desperate wickedness. But the ability which is ascribed to them, ought to be

distinctly explained. It is a natural ability in distinction from a moral. . . . . If there is no difficulty in their loving and submitting to God, but what they are to blame for, there is no natural inability; and if there is no natural inability, there is natural power." I am sure you can not find in my discourse so strong language as this.

In a note, he informs us what he means by the natural power which he ascribes to sinners. It is that which is the basis of obligation. "That basis," he says, "is the faculties of a rational soul. Where these faculties exist, there is one whom God has a right to command, and if he disobeys, to punish. . . . . And this basis of obligation may be properly denominated an ability It bears the same relation to the obligation to serve God, that the muscular strength of a slave does to the obligation to lift a weight, when bidden by his master." He says again, "The term ability, when applied to this subject, expresses only that capacity which is the basis of obligation." Was Dr. Griffin unsound in the faith? Was he a teacher of dangerous doctrines? You are well aware, that but few ministers have appeared in this country, whose labors have been crowned with such signal success as his.

The views of the late Dr. Porter, of Andover, on this subject, are apparent from the quotation already made from his seventh lecture on Homiletics. And that such were the views that were maintained by the most devoted and most successful ministers of that day, can not admit of a question. They were taught in all the theological schools in New England—in the schools of Spring, Backus, Smalley, Dwight, Hooker, Porter, Hyde, Catlin, &c.

You and I sat four years under the preaching of the venerable Dwight, and I can truly say, I never heard him preach that sinners have no ability whatever to obey the commands of God. I presume you can say the same. I presume you can say also, that you never heard this sentiment advanced by any of those excellent men who occupied the Congregational pulpits of New England at the time when you and I first entered the ministry.

You seem to think, that those ministers whose labors were so signally blessed near the close of the last, and at the beginning of the present centuries, could not have held my views on the

subject of ability and inability, because "the great and prominent doctrines of that period, were the native and entire depravity of man, his consequent lost and dependent condition, the necessity of regeneration by the Spirit of God, the doctrine of election and sovereign grace, and the necessity of special divine power in every case of conversion." You do not mean by this to insinuate, that I do not hold and teach all these doctrines? Are they not all contained in the creed of the Pastoral Union, to which I have annually given my assent for more than twenty years? And did you ever understand that I have failed to teach any of them to my pupils?

You had some acquaintance with the late Dr. Nettleton, and with his mode of preaching. I was more intimately acquainted with him, and I know that he not only did not tell sinners that they have no ability to obey God, but that he disapproved of that mode of address. When sinners told him they could not repent, he was wont to say to them, "I should not be willing to say you can not repent; I should rather say you never will repent, unless God shall renew your hearts." And was Dr. Nettleton unsound in the faith? Did he fail to preach faithfully all the great doctrines specified above? And had his preaching any of those evil tendencies which you attribute to the doctrine of my discourse? Did it lead to confusion, inconsistency, and self-contradiction? Had it any "proclivity to the Pelagian and Arminian heresies?" Did it tend "to cherish a spirit of self-confidence and independence?" Did it tend "to shield impenitence and unbelief?" Was his preaching "at variance with the scriptural account of regeneration?" You certainly will not say this. Yet that he maintained the views contained in my sermon, and that he brought them out distinctly in his preaching and conversation, I certainly know.

You think those New England ministers to whom I have referred, if put to the task of explaining what they meant by natural ability, would say that they meant by it nothing but moral agency. Doubtless they would. But yet they called it natural ability, and felt themselves justified in so doing. Dr. Griffin, as we have seen, did explain what he meant by it, and his explanation perfectly accords with my own; yet he did not hesitate to say that "it is not true that God requires of sinners

more than they are able to perform." And his mode of treating this subject, did not differ from that of his brethren generally. The language of my sermon, therefore, is warranted by good use, among the sound ministers of New England, for a century past.

You have quoted from the Catechism, and from the Confession of Faith, adopted by the elders and messengers at Saybrook, in 1708. Permit me to say, that to those quotations, understood as you understand them, and as they were intended to be understood, I can give my full and cordial assent. You do not suppose that they were intended to teach any but a moral inability; nor do you suppose they were intended to deny that men possess those intellectual and moral powers, which I call natural ability. It is well known, that before the time of Edwards, the distinction between natural and moral inability, was not well understood. Edwards did not call in question the truth of any of the doctrines of the Puritan fathers. But by means of this distinction, he was able to vindicate them more successfully than had been done by his predecessors.

Before I close, permit me to call your attention to one historical fact. In the year 1833, the Pastoral Union of Connecticut was formed, and the Theological Institute was established. Near the close of that year, I was elected by the trustees of the seminary, to my present office, and as I was informed, the election was unanimous. My views of ability and inability were well known, having been clearly set forth in two sermons which I had published in the National Preacher. Of the Board of Trustees you was, at that time, a prominent member. When I was inducted into office, I was required to give my assent to the creed of the Pastoral Union. This creed, I have understood, or at least that part of it to which I am about to refer, was drawn up by yourself. To this creed I have been required, as have been all the professors and all the trustees, to declare our assent every year. The seventh article of this creed, contains the following declaration, viz., "*That man has understanding and natural strength to do all that God requires of him;* so that nothing but the sinner's aversion to holiness, prevents his salvation."

Just compare this declaration with the doctrine of my sermon.

| SERMON. | CREED. |
| --- | --- |
| "God does not require of men what they have no power to do." | "Man has understanding and natural strength to do all that God requires of him." |

Natural power, natural strength and natural ability, are phrases of precisely the same meaning. Just invert your proposition. God does not require of man what he has not understanding and natural strength to do. If this is true, it can not be true that God requires of men what they have no power, that is, no strength to do.

Now, my dear sir, have I asserted the doctrine of man's natural ability more clearly, more fully, or more strongly than you have done? Or more fully than you, as one of the trustees of this seminary in 1833, required me to do? I appeal to you, and to every candid reader, if every objection which you have urged against the doctrine of my discourse, does not lie equally against your own creed? If I have contradicted myself, and contradicted the Bible, and taught a doctrine of most dangerous tendency, have you not done the same? *Nomine mutato*, is not your whole letter addressed to yourself? "*Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, that judgest another; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest, doest the same things.*"

You warn me to take heed to my doctrine, or I shall inevitably find myself in bad company. On this point, I have no distressing fears. I can say with Dr. Woods, "In the treatment of this subject I shall have the pleasure of going in company with such men as Edwards, Dwight, Smalley, Fuller, Day, and other well known defenders of sound theology." To this list I can add Bellamy, Griffin, Porter, Nettleton, and many other illustrious names; and last, but not least, Dr. Harvey.

You will doubtless say that by *natural strength*, in the seventh article of the creed, you meant no more than the possession of those intellectual and moral powers, which are essential to moral agency. I do not suppose you did mean anything more. Nor do I mean anything more by natural ability, nor do I suppose that any of the sound New England divines meant anything more by it. But why do you put such a different construction upon my language, which is of precisely the same import with

your own? Why do you insist, and that too in the face of my repeated declarations to the contrary, that I mean by natural ability, some extra power, over and above the faculties of a moral agent? This is a mystery which I know not how to explain.

There is one other thought suggested by this historical fact. The creed of the Pastoral Union shows what were the doctrinal views of those ministers in Connecticut, who in 1833, felt themselves called upon to take a stand against prevailing errors. It shows that they did not regard the doctrine of the sinner's natural ability, to be an error; for they inserted it in their creed as a truth to be maintained. This creed also shows in what form sound New England men were in the habit of maintaining this sentiment, which is the very form in which it is maintained in my discourse. "Man has understanding and natural strength to do all that God requires of him." Or what is the same, "God does not require of men what they have no power [strength] to do."

I am aware that since 1833, your ecclesiastical relations have been changed; and it may be that your views of this subject have undergone a change; so far, at least, as regards the proper use of language. If this be so, I would inquire, whether we might not reasonably expect some recantation from yourself, before you proceeded to condemn others for no other crime but that of continuing to follow your former example? Permit me to bespeak some forbearance, on your part, toward those brethren who have not yet been able to see that the change is for the better, and who still adhere to that form of sound words, which you prepared for them twenty years ago.

I would say in conclusion, that having written what seemed to be necessary in explanation and vindication of my views, as set forth in the sermon to which you have taken such serious exceptions; I now drop the discussion, with the full purpose not to resume it, unless there shall be more occasion for it than I now anticipate. My age and the state of my health forbid my engaging in a protracted controversy; nor can I believe that such a controversy on this subject, would be for the edification of the church. Yours, truly,

B. TYLER.

East Windsor Hill, Feb. 9, 1855.

P. S.—I intended to say a word respecting the connection between the text and doctrine of my discourse. You think the doctrine, so far from being contained in the text, is utterly at variance with it. But I would ask, was it not the design of the apostle in the text, to teach the Corinthians that he did not require them to give in charity more than they were able to give? And in teaching this, did he not lay down a general principle applicable to all branches of duty?

Suppose that on being requested by an agent to contribute to some benevolent object, you should say, fifty dollars is all that I am able to give to this object, but that I will give cheerfully. Very well, he replies, that is all I can ask of you. "If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath and not according to that he hath not." Would you not understand him to mean, that he could not reasonably ask you to do what you have no ability to do? and not only in this particular case, but in any case whatever?

But you say, "The true sentiment is, the willing mind is accepted in the use of such means and powers as a man has." That is, if I understand you, God does not require of the man who has a willing mind, what he has no ability to do, and if he were to do so, the command would not be just. But if it would be unjust in God to require impossibilities of good men, how can it be just to require impossibilities of wicked men? "Are not my ways equal? saith the Lord."

But you will say, God requires the willing mind; and although with a willing mind, men can do what God requires, yet they have no ability to get the willing mind. But according to Edwards, a man has natural ability to do a thing, when he can do it if he wills. And surely a man can have a willing mind if he wills; for as Edwards says, "the willing is the doing. When once he has willed, the thing is performed." And hence he says, "To ascribe the non-performance to *the want of power or ability is not just;* because the thing wanting is not a being *able*, but a being *willing*."

A

# SECOND LETTER

TO

# The Rev. Dr. Tyler

ON

# HUMAN ABILITY AND INABILITY.

BY

**JOSEPH HARVEY, D. D.**

PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, THOMPSONVILLE, CONN.

HARTFORD:

CALHOUN STEAM PRINTING CO., 26 STATE STREET.

1855.

# LETTER.

DR. TYLER:

*Reverend and Dear Sir,*

Your Letter of the 9th ult, is received, for which please accept my thanks. I am happy to perceive that our correspondence is working out favorable results, one of which is an explicit statement from you, that by natural ability you mean moral agency, and nothing more. This will serve to arrest impressions already made, and prevent their being made still more extensively, that you have been teaching sinners that they have power to do their duty independently of divine aid. Although this is a misconstruction of your language, as now appears, it is a construction which a very large class of your readers would naturally give to the terms of your doctrine. All liability to such a construction you will doubtless wish carefully to avoid. A more explicit statement therefore was very desirable. That object is gained, and henceforth it will be understood by all, that what you mean is, that men can do their duty if rightly disposed. Here all controversy as to that matter is ended.

There is yet another question, connected with this subject, concerning which I wish to offer a few thoughts. And that question relates to the expediency and propriety of using the terms natural ability to designate moral agency. But, before I enter on the discussion of that question, I will dispose of some few smaller matters which seem to require a brief notice.

The first is the scrap of history which you have seen proper to introduce, near the close of your letter. I regret the occurence of any personalities between us, as not conducive to any valuable purpose. I cannot see why an error of sentiment or language is any

the less an error because I once held it. I assure you I would condemn it just as soon in myself as in you. But I still more regret this attempt at personality, because you do not appear to be in possession of all the material facts in the case. Your statement is defective by an omission, which, if designed, can hardly be consistant with honor or honesty. And as I consider you incapable of designed misrepresentation, I am constrained to presume that you are ignorant of some important particulars, suffer me then to supplement your history by appending a brief statement. That the creed of the Pastoral Union was compiled by me I believe is true. It is also true that, since its adoption by the Union, but previously to the appearance of your discourse on Human Ability and Inability, I had been written to in behalf of the Union, as I suppose, requesting of me an exposition of the article to which you refer. In my reply, after saying, in amount, that I understood the article to express simply moral agency, I proceed to say, "I cannot but regret the ambignity of the language. So far as I had any agency in its adoption, I am responsible for a blunder, though not an intentional error. My only apology is, that I was trammeled by the unmeaning distinction, rife at that day in Connecticut, between natural and moral ability and inability. The ground of that distinction I have abandoned, considering it untenable, unscriptural. And were I to write that seventh article again, I think I should not be likely to use language that might admit of two opposite constructions. If by ability we mean power, adequate to a given effect, and this is the only legitimate meaning, then moral agency or natural power, in the case of the sinner, is no ability at all. For who will contend that a man is able to love God, with his understanding, conscience or reason alone, or with his heart even, which is full of enmity. We might as well talk of loving God with our bodily limbs, or of ability to love what we hate. I consider the maxim, that ability and obligation are and must be commensurate, in moral relations, as subversive of all sound doctrine, as well as repugnant to common sense. Disposition or state of heart is an element that enters largely into ability to do moral acts. Now, if a man is obligated to do only what he is disposed to do, I see not but sin is its own justification, and the more sin, the less obligation."

You thus see, my dear sir, that your appeal to me to recant my own error, before I undertake to expose yours, is superfluous. The truth is, I have recanted, I have washed my hands clean of this inconsistency, a truth which you ought to have known before you attempted your historical sketch, and the means of knowing which

were in your immediate neighberhood, in the hands of the secretary of the Pastoral Union. Though I impute to you no sinister motive in this omission of material facts, yet I cannot but feel that this act of injustice arises from culpable neglect to examine the sources of information within your rearch. But, as the truth of the case is the text, "Therefore thou art inexcusable O man, &c.," does not hit me at all, when you have recanted and I blame you for it, then and there will be the time and place for your text. If I am correctly informed, as I believe I am, the Pastoral Union also has expurgated its creed so far as to relieve the said seventh article from all liability to misconstruction; so that, in your next annual assent to it, you will find both example and precept on the side of modification; and if you persist in retaining your favorite phraseology, you will be "left alone in your glory."

Another point, which seems to require a moments attention, is your complaint of misapprehensions and misrepresentations on my part. Admitting that these are, as you say, many and great, and run through my pamphlet, the case still admits of a question, whether the fault is mine, or that of your language. I am sure I did my best to understand your discourse correctly and to decipher its true meaning. If I have failed in this, the next question is who is responsible for that failure. I had no means of knowing your meaning but by your language and statements. If these were contradictory and confused, and my mind was misled by them, how am I in fault? To give you an example of the difficulty, your doctrinal proposition, as the head and front of your discourse, is stated thus: "God does not require of men, what they have no power to do." Nearly three pages from this doctrinal proposition, you say, "my meaning is, that he does not require of them what they might not do were they rightly disposed." Now you claim that this latter statement is to be taken as explanatory of the former, or main doctrine. With all deference I question the legitimacy of this claim. There is a difference between an explanation and a contradiction. Supposing a person should state that a thing is *black*, and afterwards should say, my meaning is it is *white*, would the latter statement be an explanation of the former. Contradiction or retraction it might be, but explanation it could not be. And how are we to ascertain the real meaning of statements thus situated? We must weigh circumstances. If the former statement is most prominent, is given in Italics as emphatical, is the burden of argument and remark, is proposed as a leading commanding thought; while the other is in obscurity, has no mark of emphasis, and is in no way

conspicuous; the proper conclusion would be, the former statement is the one for which the author makes himself responsible. A reviewer therefore takes it upon him to say, such an author asserts that such a thing is *black*. But the author turns upon him and says, your misrepresentations are many and great, and run through your pamphlet. Did I not tell you in plain words that my meaning is, that the thing is *white?* How could I make my meaning plainer? Who, I ask, would be at fault here, the reviewer or the author? But you will say, perhaps, this is not a parrallel case. Let us see, your explanation, as you call it, contains a condition, "if rightly disposed," which implies a negation of all parts of the subject that do not come within its scope. That is to say, as men constitute the subject; if you affirm that those men can do the will of God who are rightly disposed, meaning that such disposition is essential to such doing, then you implicitly deny that those who are not rightly disposed can do that will. In other words, by making the condition the basis of the affirmation, you make the removal or absence of the condition the same as a negation. The amount of your explanation, as you call it, is, that if men are rightly disposed, they can do the will of God, but if not rightly disposed they cannot do it. Now when we come to compare this with your doctrinal proposition, and bear in mind that men generally are not rightly disposed, that none are so, except by the special grace of God, what can we make of your explanation, but an absolute contradiction of your doctrine, one asserts that God does not require of men what they have not power to do, and the other teaches by implication, that men generally and all men naturally, not being rightly disposed, have no power to do what God requires. Between the horns of such a dilemma which are we to take? Here we must weigh circumstances. The doctrine stands conspicuous, dressed in Italics, and has the station of file leader, while the explanation lies in a corner, and is among the masses of common words. If either statement expresses the sentiment of the author it must be the former. Explanation the latter cannot be, we do not feel warranted to call it retraction without farther indication, we must therefore let it pass for inadvertant contradiction. Now I regret to have perpetrated many and great misrepresentations of your meaning, but while you give your verdict against me, I trust that, under these circumstances of mitigation, you will at least recommend me to the mercy of the public.

But let me not forget that all this mystery is now made plain, that we have your real meaning from your own pen; and my pres-

ent reference to former questions is only in apology for my own mistakes. Here let the question of the meaning of natural ability rest; it is resolved into moral agency; and all we need to say of man in this respect is, that he is a responsible agent, an accountable creature. This is what we all mean, and all we mean.

We come now to the question, is moral agency properly and truly represented by the terms natural ability? Is this desirable and profitable language by which to express a state of moral responsibility. I presume I do not misrepresent you when I suppose that you assume the affirmative side of this question. Your discourse leaves no room to doubt this, and I may feel equally confident in saying that one principle argument by which you support your position is, prevalent usage among Calvinistic divines in New England for the last hundred years. In respect to this argument allow me to say, that language and definitions are liable to change, and are the proper subjects of improvement. And the fact that a term or phrase has been used to express a thought or sentiment, does not appear to be a sufficient reason why it should always be thus used, provided, a better can be found. Neither is it at all certain, that the same men who used certain terms to express a particular thought, would, if they were alive, use it now. We ought, in justice to their good sense and taste, to suppose that they would have been ready to avail themselves of all useful improvements arising in the progress of society and the increase of light. For men of candor and sense keep their minds open to conviction in pursuit of truth, and their feelings accessible to useful suggestions. There is but now and then a man of a temperament sufficiently dogged, to stereotype his views and language in early life, and to leave no room for increase or improvement in the course of a century. I would therefore respectfully suggest whether the remains of Dr. Nettleton, and of other good men who have entered into their rest, should not be suffered to repose in quiet. Whatever they have contributed to the stores of knowledge or piety, let it be duly appreciated. But to be holding up their opinions or practices as an infallible standard, by which all future generations must be governed, is simply ridiculous. They are not here to be their own interpretors, or to tell us how much their views or language would be modified by the march of improvement. And it is hardly fair to burden their names, for all coming time, with obsolete reminiscences, which they themselves, were they present, would repudiate. I feel just as much at liberty to inquire whether natural ability is a phrase that most properly represents moral agency, as if Dr.

Nettleton and all the others that you mention, had never said a word on the subject. And more, I feel it to be a bounden duty to inquire into these things and satisfy myself. And if I cannot find sound reasons or scripture proof for opinions, or practices; the fact that some good man has held them will not carry me along with them. To act otherwise makes us mere servile imitators. Notwithstanding, then, the formidable list of honored and venerable names which you array for the defense of your position, I shall take the liberty to suggest some reasons, why the phraseology in question is neither proper nor profitable.

My first reason is the equivocal character of the term ABILITY. This is a word of various and doubtful signification, arising from its use by different classes of persons or its application to different subjects. Its technical or conventional meaning, as used by theologians and preachers is one thing, its common and popular meaning is another and a very different one. In the one case it means moral agency, or what a responsible agent may be or do, if rightly disposed; in the other case it means adequate power. In regard to moral subjects the popular sense of ability is, all the power necessary to reach and produce moral effect, that is to say, both physical and moral power adequate to the effect. And if any deficiency of moral power is admitted to exist, still the common understanding of ability is, physical power sufficient to overcome or remove the moral obstacle.—Hence, in accommodation to this sense, we find the theories of self-determining power and the power of contrary choice introduced. Men in common life cannot be expected to acquaint themselves with the technicalities of theology, which are of human origin. If we use a term in addressing them, we must expect them to understand it in the popular sense. A common man, will laugh in your face if you tell him he is able to do his duty, and yet there is a sense in which he cannot do it, or that he cannot do it in any sense without divine aid, and that he is dependent on the special grace of God. To him it will be a contradiction, to his mind the whole statement is an absurdity. For this reason, wise men, even in New England, have not thought it expedient, as you admit, to introduce the terms natural ability into their popular discourses. And who will question their wisdom in this case? The truth is, make as many explanations as you can, guard and qualify as you will, the word ability, when applied to the moral state of man, will be understood to mean adequate power. This is its common and established significance. Your late discourse on the subject affords an example to the purpose. The subject was made plain, as you thought, so much

so that you knew not how to make it plainer; and yet you find occasion to complain of many and great misapprehensions: and I have not a doubt that if you would take the trouble to go around and examine your readers, you would find that nine-tenths of them understood you to say that men have adequate power to do all that God requires of them. And you may publish an hundred sermons on the same principle, with precisely the same effect. Now, since this is so, and cannot be denied, why incur this difficulty and embarrasment for the sake of a word? Why not say moral agency, if you mean that, and avoid the seeming contradiction? For myself I must say there is no ground for hesitancy. I speak with the more confidence because I have had some experience in the matter. I labored for years to maintain consistency in the use of the terms natural ability; but I found it impossible to make myself understood so as to avoid the appearance of contradiction, and, in fact, a little more than I could do to understand myself satisfactorily. I found that either self-determining power or absolute dependence on the grace of God, was the only alternative. For this reason I have been constrained to abandon the religious use of natural ability as a word and as a thing. And I submit to the consideration of every candid mind, the question whether the terms natural ability, as applicable to the moral state of fallen man, and on a want of their liability to misconstruction, are not eminently unprofitable and perplexing, and therefore to be dropped out of the theological vocabulary by all who intend to avoid the shoals of Arminian laxity.

My second reason against the use of the terms natural ability, is that so far as usage has any weight in the case, the great preponderance of usage and authority in the christian church is adverse to such use. You claim that these terms are sanctioned by the usage of the Divines and churches of New England for a century past. Suppose it to be so, what then? New England is not all the world, nor all the territory of the church. And why is New England and her usage to be the standard or the pole star of the christian world? Let us try to extend our view a little beyond the limits of New England and see if we cannot find theologians and christians of some note, and worthy of some deference in regard to such a question. Probably you have heard of such men as John Calvin, Martin Luther and Turretin and Owen, and Toplady; you may have some recollection of an assembly of Divines that met for the special purpose of settling points of doctrine; you are aware of the fact that confessions of faith have been constructed, and formulas of christian doctrine put forth in terms and sentiment, such as appeared desira-

ble and best to the wisest and ablest men of the church from the Reformation to the present day; and what do we find in regard to the use of the terms in question? In what confession of faith or formula of doctrine, since the Reformation, do we find the terms natural ability applied to the natural and moral state of man? In which of them all do we not find directly the opposite form of expression, the platforms of New England itself not excepted. If there is some small corner in your field of vision which your use of New England and Dr. Nettleton does not fill, I would bring to your notice the Presbyterian church, with its distinguished writers, eminent Divines and theological seminaries. Where among them do you find any sanction for the terms in question? Where indeed do you not find these terms repudiated, and their opposites adopted? Now, if in your judgment, New England and Dr. Nettleton outweigh, in authority, all the rest of the christian world, then all I have to say is, there is no disputing about tastes.

My third reason against the use of the terms natural ability is, that they tend to mislead and deceive men in the most important of all their concerns.

In giving public instruction, the meaning or intention of the speaker or writer, is not the point of chief importance, but the meaning which he conveys to others, or the sense in which he will be understood, is the paramount consideration. He may be correct in his views as they lie in his own mind, and honest in his intentions to present correct views to others, and yet his language may be such as is adapted to make a wrong impression, and does actually make such an impression. In which case, though the teacher may be free of intentional fault, yet the learner is led astray and made to suffer all the effects of error. This objection I apprehend lies, in all its weight, against the use of the terms natural ability. We will suppose that they mean, in the mind of him who uses them, moral agency, and nothing more. He intends by their use to convey the sentiment that men are living and acting as free responsible beings, the proper subjects of moral government, having all the power requisite to do their duty, if rightly disposed. But will men in general understand the terms in this sense, will they receive the impression that while all this is true, by reason of a wrong disposition, or what is the same thing, their indwelling depravity, they are entirely and absolutely dependent on Divine grace, and the subjects of a moral inability, which is as surely connected with its effects and will as surely hold them in its power, and prevent any saving or holy emotions or acts, as any natural cause? To answer this question

correctly we must recollect that the popular meaning of ability is adequate power. Natural ability in the popular mind is natural power to do all that is required, including disposition or motive. So long as this is true, the impression which is made by the terms in question is erroneous, and the effect will be disastrous. And the tendency to this result, arising from the deceitfulness and desperate wickedness of the heart is so strong that no explanations or qualifications will suffice to counteract it. The probable result of such use of the terms, natural ability to perform duty in the case of the sinner, will be that of Arminian self-righteousness. To perceive the justness of these deductions, let us look a little more closely at the import of moral agency compared with the popular sense of natural ability. A moral agent is a being that is capable of performing actions that have a moral quality. That quality may be good or bad, holy or sinful, and the integrity of moral agency is not impaired. A being may be wholly depraved in his disposition, under the full power of the carnal mind which is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be, and yet be a moral agent; because in all this he is voluntary acting from a choice according to his own disposition. And there is no degree of depravity to which he may not go and yet be a moral agent. Satan and his associate spirits, in all the inveteracy and desperation of their wickedness, are moral agents. And yet in perfect consistency with their moral freedom, accountability and just desert of punishment, they are figuratively described as reserved in everlasting chains under darkness to the judgement of the Great Day. That is to say, if I rightly understand it, such is the strength of their depravity and its supreme control over all their powers, that being left to themselves without any provision or interposition of efficacious grace, the moral consequence of perpetual wickedness and woe is just as sure and unavoidable as the suspension and prevention of bodily action would be, if the body were in chains within the massive walls of a prison. Their chains are evil dispositions unrestrained, their prison is the darkness of entire wickedness and utter despair. These are represented as everlasting. There is therefore no moral possibility of their escape. They have no ability to reform or return, that is to say, no ability that can avail or become effectual. And yet fallen spirits are moral agents as truly as men are, or as angels in heaven are. Now where would be the propriety or profit of preaching natural ability to fallen angels? Would you do it to convict them of sin? They are convicted already. Would you do it to induce them to reform? They know too well their own condition to admit

or cherish such a hope. All the boon they ask or expect is "torment us not before the time." Will it be said the situation of fallen men and fallen angels is essentially different? True, in respect to the provisions and invitations of the gospel it is, but in respect to their natural ability, or any good which will ever result from it, how do the cases differ, except in the degree of maturity? How is a man left to himself and to the resources of his natural ability, as were Pharaoh, Saul, Ahab and Judas Iscariot, in any more hopeful case than fallen angels? The hopefulness of man's state arises from the revealed purpose of grace, and its possible intervention in his behalf, not from his moral agency or natural ability.

It appears then, that moral agency may consist with the most hopeless depravity, and that it does not touch the question whether the agent is holy or sinful; and leaves ample room for the desperate wickedness of the human heart to have full scope. And if natural ability means the same as moral agency, it leaves the same room, and consists with the same desperate condition. That is to say, the sinner having natural ability to do his duty, is still in a condition, from which, if left to himself, it is absolutely certain he never will escape, and in which, left to himself, he will as surely perish, as he would surely remain motionless if he were dead, or sink to the bottom of the ocean with a mill-stone about his neck. Now this moral certainty or necessity as some call it, is the same in effect as moral inability, and the moral effect is so certainly connected with its moral cause, that it is justly termed inability. It is inability to all intents and purposes. And it is called moral, not to indicate any want of efficacy or power, but to show that its nature differs from compulsion and constraint, and therefore it affords no excuse for sin, but is rather sin itself, in its most aggravated and malignant form. If then depravity is indicated by the term inability, and its correlative terms such as *cannot*; will not the term ability, and correlative *can*, be naturally and generally understood to mean the opposite? What is more natural than to conclude that *ability* is the opposite in its meaning to *inability*, and *can* to *cannot*. If then inability means depravity, and cannot means will not, what is more natural than to suppose that ability means the opposite to depravity, namely: moral rectitude, or that which will produce it, and that *can* means *will*, or a power to will at option? True the theologian or preacher puts in the qualifying words *moral* and *natural*. But these are technical terms, the force of which is not comprehended by one of an hundred of those whose eternal destiny is suspended on their gaining a knowledge of the truth in the case. Besides, the

sinner, while he has an infinite interest in knowing and believing the truth, has a strong inclination to the error. That he has ability to help himself when he pleases, is much more to his taste than the doctrine of dependence. All his feelings of pride and self-confidence revolt against the one, and stand ready to welcome the other. In these circumstances, what is the natural and almost unavoidable consequence of using the terms natural ability for moral agency, but to lead men astray from the truth and to deceive them in a point of vital importance?

I say nothing here of the views of those who intend to teach by the terms natural ability or similar language, that fallen men have inherent power adequate to their own recovery; and many such there are. But I speak now of the use of the terms in question in the sense of moral agency, and of those, who notwithstanding that use, intend to inculcate, unwaveringly, the doctrines of entire depravity and special grace. Now that such teachers will more or less counteract their own labors by the use of the terms in question is to be apprehended, not only on account of the equivocal character of the terms themselves, and their adaptedness to the wrong bias of fallen nature, but also from the obscurity which will ever rest on technical terms to common perception, and the difficulty of making the meaning of those terms plain and precise to the popular mind. You may speak of moral agency, and define it with logical exactness; but the moment you attempt to construct an argument on that definition, the buttresses all give way in the popular mind, and your hearers do not know what you are talking about. So you may say of natural ability, it means the same as moral agency; but the meaning of ability is so much more obvious in the popular sense than that of moral agency, that the conclusion, in most minds, will be, that if they mean the same thing, moral agency may as well be explained by ability; and as the former, in the veiw of most persons, needs explanation rather than the latter, they will go away with the impression that the amount of the whole is, that they have ample power to meet every demand and need give themselves no further trouble. In other words they will explain moral agency by ability as they understand it, rather than ability by moral agency. For every one thinks he knows without explanation, what ability means. Consequently explanation will do more harm than good. The only method by which this difficulty can be avoided seems to be to state the plain and obvious aspects which are open to common observation, rather than attempt to explain the principles that underlie those manifestations. Thus if on the whole, all things con-

sidered, you believe that sinners are able to do their duty; say so, and they will understand you. If, all things considered, you believe that they are not able, and that such doing never is a fact, and never will be, as the result of any natural power or effort, say so and they will understand you. This is the scriptural method of treating the subject, as appears in the practice of our Saviour and all his inspired servants. They state the features of the case just as they appear and are confirmed by continuous developments. "No man can come unto me"; and the deduction is equally manifest. "Ye will not come unto me." No explanation is attempted, no different senses are obtruded, no apology offered. The plain fact and the obvious conclusion are all that was deemed important in the case. According to this example the use of the terms natural ability is precluded, for they appear to mean the reverse of obvious facts, and must be explained to have a color of truth, and the explanation involves more difficulty than it removes. To say sinners have natural ability and not explain it, leads to the ruin which attends all self-confidence. To say it, and attempt to explain it, only makes bad worse by involving the subject in apparent contradiction and absurdity. The only alternative is not to say it at all; but state the matter according to its visible aspects, and undeniable facts. It may be said, perhaps, that inability also needs explanation to avoid serious objection. I reply, what is known to be true is worthy of consideration, whether we can explain it or not. If sin discovers an invincible obstinacy and power in the human heart, which set at defiance every means and effort for its subjection, it is a matter of interest to all concerned, whether they can see the consistency of this fact or not; and if sinners are unable to save themselves it is all important that they should know it forthwith, that they may seasonably seek help where it may be had. But while this is true, the explanation in this case is not difficult and involves no apparent contradiction or absurdity. We have only to appeal to the sinners own consciousness in the case, that he is acting voluntarily and according to his own disposition, and therefore that his inability is the source of all his criminality, as it is nothing more nor less than his depravity. And if this be true no one will question the impropriety or danger of using the terms natural ability as applicable to his case; or the pressing necessity of making him early and deeply sensible that he has destroyed himself, and that in God is his help.

My closing reason against the use of the terms natural ability, as synonymous with moral agency, is that the use is both *unscriptural* and *anti-scriptural.*

That there is no warrant in the scriptures for the use of these terms will not be questioned by any one. On this point therefore I need not dwell. Still more evident is it, that scriptural usage of language is directly the opposite to the phraseology in question. I say still more evident, because, in the latter case we have the positive evidence of actual practice, while in the former we have, as we can have, only the negative evidence of absence. Here then on scriptural authority I take my stand, and against all your arguments or authorities to the contrary, I hold up the shield of divine and inspired example. You seem to think that I should be shocked to hear sinners told that they cannot do their duty. This is the same as to say that the language and the sentiment are shocking. If you esteem them so, you must be often shocked in reading your Bible. For you cannot read much without meeting both the language and the sentiment most plainly and explicitly stated, and that without any attempt at explanation.

I might enlarge to advantage on this topic, but having had occasion in my former letter to say something upon it, I presume there will be no need of reiteration or reinforcement in this quarter. The fact stands out in bold relief in the Bible, that the practice of Christ and of his Apostles, and of the inspired writers generally, is all decidedly against the use of the terms in question.

In conclusion, I remark, I do not agree with you that the discussion of this, or any other subject "of great practical importance" will not be for the edification of the churches. Protestants generally do not adopt the Popish maxim that ignorance is the mother of devotion. On the contrary, the Reformation was begun and has been carried on by controversy. Truth has nothing to fear from exposure. It is error or delusion only that seeks concealment.

When you published your sermon and sent it abroad, thereby provoking if not challenging controversy, you probably thought it would be for the edification of the churches. And it is too late for you to begin to deprecate the effects of your own measures. If you thought controversy to be injurious, why did you come out into the arena, in the attitude of a combatant, and throw down your gauntlet? You are not much older or more infirm now, than when you determined to broach a controverted subject in your late discourse. If you did not relish controversy you should not have begun it.

But whatever may be your feelings on the subject, there are, and have been those who consider discussion, and even controversy, conducted in a christian spirit, so far from a calamity, as to be an essential element of purity and lasting peace in the church. Where

had been the christian faith but for controversy? In the language of Dr. Cumming: "Many deprecate controversy. They think it fitted for battle fields, not for the peaceful pastures of the gospel. I think differently. In politics, excitement is the peril. In religion, stagnation is the peril. Men may be too much excited about civil matters, they are always under excited about religious truth. I think that what we have to fear in religion is not life but death. Give me life—life with its excesses,—in its wildest excesses, rather than the silence and with it the corruption of death. A living dog is better than a dead lion."

On the other hand there are those who decry all controversy and discrimination as mere hair-splitting. For, while error and delusion in religious concerns have their open and shameless advocates, they have also their pimps, in the shape of time-serving editors and preachers, who, forsooth, will have the gospel in their sense preached to the poor, as if the poor have no need to know what they believe. One thing is certain. To whomsoever they preach or communicate the conglomerate which they call the gospel, they are sure to preach it to the poor, for their teaching will make and keep men poor in one sense if not more.

But you are not the man I trust that will shrink from defending the truth, especially in respect to points of "great practical importance." You doubtless understand your responsibilities for the maintenance of pure evangelical doctrine, in its distinct and primeval features, the maintenance of the Gospel, not of New England, not of this or that favorite Doctor, but of Jesus Christ; you will doubtless be found at your post ready for the call of duty.

And that you may be a resolute and successful defender of the faith once delivered to the saints, as well as a skillful and useful instructor of those who themselves shall become preachers of the gospel and guides to souls, is the desire and hope of

Your Friend and Brother,

J. HARVEY.

THOMPSONVILLE, MARCH 3D, 1855.

# A LETTER

TO

# THE REV. DR. TYLER,

RESPECTING HIS DISCOURSE ON

# Human Ability and Inability,

AND HIS LETTER

TO

# THE REV. DR. HARVEY.

BY IRA CASE,
MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.

HANOVER:
PRINTED AT THE DARTMOUTH PRESS.
April—1855.

# LETTER.

Rev. Dr. Tyler,

Dear Sir:—I received the copy which you was so kind as to send me, of your letter to Dr. Harvey in reply to his strictures on your sermon. I thank you for the favor, and beg leave to invite your attention to a few thoughts which have arisen in my own mind on the subject of discussion. The subject of "Human Ability and Inability," is to me one of special and deep interest, both on account of its intrinsic nature and practical importance, and because my *spirit was stirred within me* by the views of it which I found prevailing in the Seminary where my course of theological study was begun. The manner in which I found this fundamental subject, especially, to be treated at Andover, was the principal cause of my removal to East Windsor. Unwilling to examine it *long*, standing in the dense fogs and pestilential vapors which surround the Chair of Theology, and which naturally rise only from Pelagian and Arminian quagmires, I went to East Windsor with the hope of viewing this, and all the subjects connected with it, in an atmosphere more transparent and pure. Much of the instruction there, I did receive with satisfaction and gratitude. Yet I believe you were aware of the fact that I could not always approve of the *form* of your statements on the subject of "Ability." In the intended import of your language, I supposed we more generally agreed. That is, when you *said* that sinners are *able*, but *disinclined* to obey the commands of God, I did not generally understand you to mean that sinners *can actually* love and obey God, of themselves, but only that they are moral agents, and under obligation to do all that God requires. Now if you had only said in your discourse, what I then generally understood you to mean, I should not have entered upon this discussion. But believing as I do, that the language of your late published Discourse and Letter to Dr. Harvey naturally, and legitimately conveys the sentiment, already painfully and alarm-

ingly prevalent, that sinners *can*, of themselves, do all that God requires, it appears to me that a farther discussion of the subject is urgently called for, and may, with the blessing of God, be "for the edification of the church." I may not furnish any occasion for you to resume the discussion, but if your age and state of health forbid it, I cannot but regret that you have appeared at this late hour as the public advocate of a sentiment which I regard as unscriptural and pernicious. I deeply regret that the advocates of this sentiment, before sufficiently numerous and bold, should be permitted to hail you as an ally, and take shelter under the wing of East Windsor, and use the name and reputation of Dr. Tyler to sustain and promote an error, which tends to subvert the whole gospel. Doubtless you are unprepared to believe that any such use can be legitimately made of your Discourse and Letter.

Let us then see what positive doctrine you have really advanced, and candidly examine whether that doctrine is true or false. You have stated your doctrine in a negative form thus: — "*God does not require of men what they have no power to do.*" Let us put this into a positive form, shaping it carefully by your own explanations and see what it is. The positive of this bare statement is this:—All men have power, or at least, *some* power to do all that God requires. This you will not attempt to deny. Let us then first settle the question, what is the legitimate import of this statement of your doctrine; and afterwards we will see how it is illustrated and modified by your explanations, adhering to the principle that nothing can be admitted as an explanation of a statement, which contradicts the statement itself. What then, without explanation, is the legitimate import of the statement, that all men have power, or *some* power to do all that God requires? It means that all men *can actually do* all that God requires. *Some* power *to do* any specific thing, is the same as full, adequate power to do it. You have admitted this, at least virtually. After laying down the principle that "We never blame a person for not doing what he has *no power* to do," you go on to say, "If a parent should command a child to perform service which required the strength of a giant, we should say, without hesitation, that the command imposed no obligation upon the child, and that he incurred no guilt in disobeying." This is equivalent to saying, that a child has *no power* to exert the strength of a giant. And yet the child may

have *some* strength of the same kind with that of the giant. But because he has not full, adequate strength to do the thing required, you would say he has *no power* to do it. And so would any one say. Again, you say, "We have heard of the taskmasters of Egypt, who required of the Israelites what they had no power to perform." And yet the Israelites had *some* strength of the very kind requisite for the work, and could doubtless have performed, and evidently did perform *a part* of the very task imposed. But because they could not perform the whole task required, you say, as any one would say, that they had *no power* to perform it. Still again you say, "Suppose the government of a State should impose upon the people exorbitant taxes—taxes which the people are utterly unable to pay." Now, it is hardly supposable that the people of a State have not *some* means of paying taxes, or that they might not pay some small fraction of any tax imposed. But because in the case supposed they have not adequate means of paying the whole, you suppose them "*utterly unable* to pay." Any one else would do the same. You then admit the principle, and every one acts upon it in the use of language, that *some* power *to do* any specific thing, is the same as full, adequate power to do it. It may not imply power of every kind, but it implies power *actually to do it*, and that is enough.

Now then, I trust the point is established that your doctrine, affirmatively stated, that all men have power, or *some* power to do all that God requires, legitimately means, as I have said, that all men *can actually do* all that God requires. This is certainly its legitimate import, when not explained. Now, let us see how it is illustrated and modified by explanations in your Discourse and Letter. On page 10th of your Discourse we find the following: 'When I say — that God does not require of men what they have *no power* to do, my meaning is, that all his commands are limited by the faculties which he has given them." Here let us pause for a moment, before looking at the next clause. This is certainly meaning a very different thing from what you say. One's duty may be limited by his faculties, while yet such is his state of heart, that he has no power to do what God requires. State of heart is not called a faculty, and yet power to do what God requires depends upon it, so that where this state is one of total deadness in sin and enmity against God, there is no power to do what God requires. Now, your doctrine reaches this fact, and

flatly contradicts it, while your explanation does not reach it at all. The duty both of saints and sinners may be alike limited by their faculties, and yet saints may have power to do their duty, while sinners have no power to do it. But this cannot be true if God does not require of men what they have no power to do. Taking this, then, as your meaning, you certainly *say* much more than you *mean*. And while your meaning is true, your words are false. Now, leaving out the clause already disposed of, your explanation will read thus—"When I say—that God does not require of men what they have no power to do, my meaning is, that he does not require of them what they might not do, were they rightly disposed." Stop here, for I wish to examine one proposition at a time. This evidently implies that if any are not rightly disposed, they cannot do what God requires. That sinners are not rightly disposed, you abundantly admit. You say, "they are averse to their duty." With this in view, your explanation amounts to this, "When I say—that God does not require of men what they have no power to do,"—or the same affirmatively,—"that all men have power to do all that God requires, my meaning is that so far as any are rightly disposed, they have power, but that all who are not rightly disposed, that is, all unrenewed sinners, have *no power* to do what God requires"! This reminds me of what is somewhere said by the younger Edwards, of those who teach error, that they "are doomed perpetually to contradict themselves." But the explanatory passage, which we are examining, contains one more expression of your meaning. It is this, "that they" (men) "have all the power which is necessary to render them proper subjects of moral government, and to render their disobedience in every instance, utterly inexcusable." Now in regard to this, I ask, could not any Pelagian, or Arminian, say the same? Could he not say that he claimed for men no more power than this? A great question is, *what is the power, which is thus requisite to moral obligation?* This is the very question which constitutes the dividing line between two great systems of doctrine, which may be traced far back into the past ages of the church. On one side of this line, all Pelagians and Arminians have stood, and all Augustinians and Calvinists on the other. Now your explanation gives no answer to the above question. It does not show at all on which side of this important line you stand. It is easy to see on which side the

doctrine of your Discourse is found. But the explanatory proposition now before us, does nothing towards defining your position. If we take it in an orthodox or Calvinistic sense, then we have in it another flat contradiction of your doctrinal proposition. If we take it in the Arminian sense, then we have something vastly worse. You see then, that your explanation is ambiguous and doubtful, while your doctrinal proposition is explicit and certain. In it you virtually say that all men can actually do all that God requires. Now what more would a Pelagian or an Arminian say in answer to the great dividing question, what power is necessary to moral obligation? If then we let your plain doctrinal proposition explain your ambiguous explanation, your position will be defined. Your declarations are indeed sufficiently explicit and full, that by the power to do all that God requires, you intend that power, and that only, which consists in the essential faculties of moral agency. But now the question is, *what that power is*, or what it can do. All that God requires; is the answer drawn from your doctrinal proposition. That men have this power, you tell us in your statement of doctrine. And in your explanations, you tell us where this power lies, viz.: in those faculties which are essential to moral agency. Now I am constrained to exclaim, Indeed! Is this your view of moral agency? Is there in these faculties, as they exist in one dead in sin, a power *to do* all that God requires? If there is, then your doctrine is true, if not, it is false. Tremendously false! For you yourself represent the difference between the two views as tremendous. You say, "Does God punish his creatures eternally for not doing what they have *no* power to do? Who can believe this to be the character of God? Were such an opinion of his character to prevail throughout his dominions, every angel would drop his harp, and veil himself in sackcloth, and the whole universe would be filled with mourning, lamentation and wo." Your doctrine then, in the light of your explanations,—all contradictions aside,—is this, *Every moral agent can do all that God requires, without the aid of divine grace.* I add the last clause, because you say, "If man has no ability to do his duty without grace, God is in justice bound, either to give him grace, or to excuse him from doing his duty." Thus excluding all gracious aid, you still teach that every moral agent can do all that God requires. This then, is the form which your doctrine takes when illustrated and modi-

fied by your explanations, in your Discourse and Letter. Now I ask, in all sincerity, *is this your meaning?* For I confess that after all the opportunities which I enjoyed in your lecture room for hearing your instructions on this subject, and after all my endeavors in private interviews to ascertain precisely your view, and after my best and most candid efforts to get at the views of your own mind, by searching what you have lately published, after all this, I still remain in some doubt. In regard to your real meaning, or private belief on the subject, I can come to no other conclusion than this, that your accustomed manner of treating the subject, necessarily produces some confusion in your own mind. You feel that Dr. Harvey has greatly misrepresented your meaning, and done you great injustice in believing that you mean by natural ability, something more than the essential powers of moral agency. You earnestly resist the imputation to you of a belief in some "extra power which serves when moral agency fails." Now have I misrepresented your meaning in ascribing to you the sentiment, that every moral agent can do all that God requires without grace? That I have drawn this sentiment from the language of your Discourse and Letter, by fair and legitimate construction, I think must be evident to every clear and candid mind. For since you virtually say that men have power to do all that God requires, that they cannot be under obligation to do what they have no power to do, and deny the belief in any extra power which is not essential to moral agency, and also exclude all gracious ability, it must be implied that every moral agent can do all that God requires without grace. This is the impression made by your Discourse upon my own mind, and I believe this will be its general impression.

Now, then, the main question by which to determine the value of your Discourse is this: Is the above sentiment *true*, or is it *false?* It is not a mere question of phraseology; it is a question of fundamental truth and fundamental error. If every moral agent *can* do all that God requires, without grace, it is proper to *say* that he can, and to preach this doctrine earnestly, as you have done. If he *cannot*, then it is certainly improper and very injurious to say and preach that he can. I believe he cannot; while your Discourse, so far as it is believed, will make the impression that he can, and wider still, perhaps, will be the impression, and the vain-glorious assertion, that Dr. Tyler believes this. For this

reason, I am greatly grieved that you have written, preached, and published such a Discourse. Grieved that you must thus bow among the many worshippers in this house of Rimmon. Now, I wish you would distinctly answer, at least to yourself, the question, *Can* every moral agent do all that God requires, without grace? I think it would extricate the subject from great confusion. I know how you are accustomed to answer it. You say, "In one sense he can, and in one sense he cannot." To this answer I seriously object. It is *no answer*. The very point of the question returns again with all the force which it had before. And now the earnest inquirer has a right to demand of you again, and with some indignation, "Is it on the whole *possible* for every moral agent, to do all that God requires, without grace? Was it not plain that *this* was the very thing which I desired to know? Why then do you mock me, by presenting the answer in one breath, and wholly withdrawing it in the next?" I say such double-dealing as your answer above exhibits, might justly provoke an earnest inquirer thus indignantly to return upon you. If he was ignorant of the true answer before, he is no less ignorant now. All the doubt and uncertainty remains in his mind, if indeed the real answer stands clear in your own. Will he not justly charge you with either unfairness or confusion of ideas, in respect to the very point in question? Every unrenewed sinner is a moral agent without grace; taking grace in the special sense here intended. Can he do all that God requires, or not? To this question I desire an answer — a *real* answer. I have found one in your Discourse, the truth of which I shall soon proceed to examine. But since I have called in question your *double* answer, let us dispose of that first. Taking one part of this double answer, you say he is in a sense unable. That he has no *moral* power you admit. You believe that he is under "the most absolute moral inability." That he has no "right disposition," nor any "disposition to get a right disposition." That he is positively "bent on rebellion." That "so inveterate is his opposition to holiness, that nothing but Divine Power *will* subdue it." That this is his moral state, you and I alike fully believe. Now, this being his moral state, — a state of "the most absolute moral inability" to do what God requires, — I ask, *can he do it?* If he *can*, it is not true that he *cannot*. If he *can* with his natural power, then his want of moral power does not *disable* him for the task. It con-

stitutes no real inability. Ability and inability, in relation to the same act or duty, are *opposites*, as truly as black and white, north and south, east and west. They cannot both be predicated at once of the same person, with any more truth, than a given object can be said to be at once wholly north and wholly south of a given line running directly east and west. The question, Can the unrenewed sinner do all that God requires? is a line, on one side or the other of which, the sinner stands. *Can*, places him wholly on one side; *Cannot*, wholly on the other. That he should stand wholly on both sides at once is obviously an utter impossibility. To use language which places him thus, is an intolerable absurdity, and produces intolerable confusion, especially in preaching. You have trodden in these meshes, and seemed to feel the threads of the net, and tried to extricate yourself; or rather, tried to show that there was no net at all. You say, "But shall we tell men that they can and they can't, that they are able and unable? Is not this to preach contradictions?" To my mind, it is perfectly obvious that it is. So obvious, that it is extremely difficult to see how any proof can make it plainer. But you proceed, "I answer, if we were to tell men that they are able to repent and unable in the same sense, this would indeed be a contradiction. But is it a contradiction to tell them that they are in one sense able and in another sense unable?" I answer yes, in strictness of speech, it is a direct contradiction. It is as perfectly so as it would be to point towards the north and say, in one sense that is north, and in another sense it is south. As this would be to predicate two opposite attributes of one single point of compass, so in the other case, you predicate two opposite attributes at once of one single subject. The sinner is the subject, and repentance is the duty; and this single subject cannot be at once both able and unable to perform this one specific duty. An object may be at once both north and south in relation to different objects, but not in relation to the same object. So a man may be at once both able and unable in relation to different acts, but not in relation to the same act. Especially is this obvious, when, as in this case, the act is purely *moral*, and internal. For the performance of this kind of acts, power of the same kind, that is, moral power, is most obviously requisite. And while he is in this very sense *unable*, how is it possible that any power of another kind, can render him *able* to perform this particular act, or kind of acts?

How would it appear to say that a person was in one sense able to perform a certain physical act for which he had not the requisite physical strength, merely because he had the moral strength, or the inclination to do it? Suppose a man,—an insane man, if you please,—really desired to lift a mountain, or to "pluck the sun from the firmament," and on being asked, "can he do it?" you should reply, "in one sense he is able, and in another sense he is unable"! Would not this be intolerable nonsense? But why would it be more so, than to say that one dead in sin is in one sense unable, and in another sense, able to do all that God requires? Is not the moral task of the latter as far above his moral power, as the physical task of the former is above his physical power? Why then is there more absurdity and nonsense in the former answer than in the latter? *Why*?

So much I have felt constrained to say in regard to the sinner's being at once both able and unable to perform the same moral duty, because the subject is one "of great practical importance." That it is thus practically important, your Discourse is a sufficient proof. For the very soil out of which this theological tree has sprung, is this same custom of ascribing to the sinner both ability and inability to do all that God requires. Thinking it proper to do this, you must of course preach "Ability" as well as "Inability," and hence your Discourse. In this discourse, however, "Ability" seems to prevail. The *can* predominates, and so far as it does, it anihilates the *cannot*. The doctrine which I have found in it, without consciously doing the least violence to your language, the doctrine drawn from your own leading doctrinal proposition, and modified only by your own explanations, the doctrine which pervades the entire Discourse, with a few exceptions, and constitutes its very substance and marrow, and which, on the whole, is sustained and vindicated in your Letter to Dr. Harvey, is this, *Every moral agent can do all that God requires without the aid of divine grace.*

Now let us see whether this doctrine is true. First, in the light of philosophy. Take the implied sentiment, that the unrenewed sinner can do all that God requires without grace. And what does God require of him? *To be perfectly holy, as God is holy, both in heart and life.* To fulfil this requirement without grace, would be a prodigy indeed! Let us look at the actual affections or exercises, which proceed from such a state of per-

feet spirituality and holiness. One principal affection is supreme and perfect *love* to God, as a holy Being. And how can one who is *dead in sin* produce such an affection in his own heart without grace? What would be the philosophy of the operation? I can see but two modes in which it is possible to conceive of his doing it. One is, to exercise the holy and perfect love, while his moral or spiritual state remains unchanged. The other is, first to change that state, and then love as required. Unless he can do it in one, or the other of these modes, he cannot do all that God requires; in other words, God *does* "require of him what he has no power to do." Of course, you must maintain that he *can* love God perfectly in one or the other of these modes. If you can tell which of them is the easier to the sinner, will you point it out? I willingly allow you all the advantage of the easier mode. As I cannot tell which is the easier, nor which you will choose, let us examine both. Look at the first. Now will you tell me *how* the sinner can love God perfectly without a change of heart? That he *will* not, you admit. But, that he has *no power to do it*, you earnestly deny. Now I demand of you *how* he *can* do it. By what philosophy is it *possible?* An explanation from *you* would be a literary curiosity, since you say, "I have no sympathy with those, who believe in a self-determining power in the will, or in the power of contrary choice; nor with those, who ascribe to sinners a gracious ability, or any ability, which implies a right disposition, or a disposition to get a right disposition, or any thing, which is inconsistent with the most absolute moral inability." You not only admit that sinners have no right moral power; you ascribe to them a positive and tremendous wrong moral power. Not only that they are not inclined to obey God's law, but that they are positively disinclined, "bent on rebellion," "averse to their duty," and that "this aversion is so great that nothing short of the Almighty energy of the Holy Spirit *will* subdue it." Now then I repeat the question, how *can* the sinner love God perfectly as he requires, while in his present state? With all his moral helplessness upon him, and all his "inveterate opposition to holiness" and strong "aversion to duty" still in his heart, how can he *love* a holy God, perfectly as he requires; that is, "with all his heart and soul and mind and strength"? Can he both love and hate the same object, in the same view of it, with all his heart and soul, at the same time? 'Doth a fountain send forth at the

same place, sweet water and bitter?" His bad heart still remaining, will be exercised. Its selfish principle is not suspended previous to regeneration, and certainly no one can charge you with holding that it is. Selfishness and "opposition to holiness," will therefore be felt, and I ask you to explain the possibility of perfect love at the same time. No *moral* strength can be engaged in its exercise, for the sinner *has no* right moral strength; his heart is "full of evil," and "fully set in him *to do* evil." All his moral strength is opposed to holiness, and all its exercises towards it are hatred, rather than love. And what would be the philosophy of perfect love to God, in which no moral strength was engaged! Is it *possible?* Answer. Yes, for "*God does not require of men what they have no power to do.*" Well then, look at the marvellous thing; turn it over; view it thoroughly on all sides; analyze it; weigh it in the balances of the divine law; and if it is *possible*, if the sinner *can* produce it, so that it shall not be "found wanting," explain, if not the nature of the product, at least, the philosophy of its production. Are you not almost, if not altogether persuaded, frankly to admit that it is an *utter impossibility?* That the sinner, while unrenewed, has "*no power*" to do what God requires? If he *has power* to do it, then, no matter what may be his moral inability, he *can do it*, as I have shown. But the words of Smalley are here in point, "There is no such compounding with the natural man, for what he can do, without a heart to do any thing that is good, to be met with any where in the sacred Scriptures."

But if you still insist that he has power to love God as he requires, then he has power to *choose* God and holiness, as his portion. But you admit that he has no inclination to this, that the whole strength of his inclination is in the opposite direction. So that in order to choose God and holiness he must have a power of choice by which he can choose directly contrary to the whole strength of his present inclination. Is not this "the power of contrary choice"? Surely you must not be charged "with holding the Arminian notion of a self-determining power in the will, or the power of contrary choice." How then can the unrenewed sinner choose God and holiness without this power? I know you say he never *will*, but I do not see how you can say he never *can*, without confessing that the main drift of your Discourse is false, unless you resort to the other mode and say, the sinner can regene-

rate himself. Therefore I now ask you *how he can* choose God and holiness, without the power of contrary choice? To choose God, he must certainly have the power to choose directly contrary to the entire strength of his present inclination, and if this is not "the power of contrary choice," what is? Since then you do not believe in the power of contrary choice, and "have no sympathy with those who do," you certainly cannot consistently believe that the unrenewed sinner has *any* power to choose God and holiness. But God requires this; therefore God *does* "require of men what they have no power to do" while they remain unrenewed.

While we are examining this point in the light of philosophy, a few truly philosophical passages from the Discourses of Dr. Smalley, on "Natural Ability" and "Moral Inability," will be apposite and worthy of your particular attention, partly because you say, "I might quote whole pages from the Discourses of Dr. Smalley on this subject, from which it would appear that he maintained the same views which are set forth in my Sermon." He says, "In every supposable instance, sin, as far as it prevails, is inconsistent with the prevalence of its opposite, viz. duty or holiness; and involves a *real impossibilty* of its opposite's taking place, so far as *it* takes place." He speaks of sinners' "not doing things which imply real holiness, and which *cannot be done* without it, as repenting truly of their sins, believing in Christ, loving God, &c." He says, "He who is conformed in heart to God, sees a beauty in his character and government, which no one of an entirely opposite temper *can possibly* discern." He says of sinners, "They have such an evil heart to depart from the living God, that until their natures are changed it is *impossible* they should come to Christ, or choose him and his salvation." "There being, indeed, an *absolute impossibility* of a man's acting otherwise than agreeably to his own heart, as well as there is of his doing things which exceed his natural strength." "It is truly *impossible* that any one should cordially embrace the gospel, so long as he has not such a heart in him." "Because a man *must* act according to his own heart, or as he pleases; does that destroy his freedom? It is the very thing in which all free agency consists." "And the want of all principles of virtue must be as inconsistent with acting virtuously, *as even the want of those intellectual faculties which are necessary to moral agency.* And so on the other hand, as to doing *evil* things. There is *no possibil-*

*ity* of doing them, that is, knowingly, designedly, and as moral agents, without an evil disposition. Our free and moral actions are, and *must be*, as invariably guided and dictated by our minds, as they are limited and bounded be our natural power. That is, every one *must* act his own nature and choice ; otherwise he does not act himself ; *he* is not the agent." "If a good tree *could* bring forth evil fruit, and a corrupt tree good fruit ; if a good man, out of the good treasure of his heart, *could* bring forth evil things, and an evil man, out of the evil treasure, good things ; the tree could never be known by its fruit. It could never be known by a man's actions, any thing what his heart was." "Should we be afraid to say, it is *impossible* for a man to love God, or come to Christ, while his heart is altogether wicked and full of enmity against God and Christ, people would be ready to think we imagined this might sometimes happen, and that there was no *real impossibility* in it of any kind ; WHEREAS, THERE IS AS REAL, AND AS ABSOLUTE AN IMPOSSIBILITY IN THIS CASE, AS IN ANY SUPPOSABLE CASE WHATEVER." This is sound philosophy. As such, it must surely meet with your approbation, being taken from those very Discourses of Dr. Smalley, of which you so decidedly approve.

Moreover, most of it, with more in the same strain, is quoted with decided approbation by Dr. Woods, with whom also you claim to agree on the subject in question. Look, then, at what I have quoted, and look *especially* at the last sentence ; subscribe to it, and then tell me, *can* the sinner, while unrenewed, do all that God requires ? Can he do it when it is *as real, and as absolute an impossibility as exists in any supposable case whatever?* Do you answer, no ? Go, then, I pray you, and BLOT OUT your doctrine, that "God does not require of men what they have no power to do." Blot out that sentence in your Letter, "But I do think it necessary to show, that they are not *as unable* to repent as brutes and idiots and maniacs, as they certainly are, if they have no ability at all." Blot out many others of the same import, and, with true Christian magnanimity, let your retraction be as public as you have made your doctrine. Resolve NEVER again in the pulpit and from the press, to encourage and strengthen and justify the confidence of men in their own strength, already sufficiently great, by such an appeal as this, "But, my hearers, can you feel that it would be right for God to require of you what

you have absolutely no power to do? Can any rational creature in the universe feel that it would be right?" Abandon *forever* the practice of wielding this tremendously efficient instrument for inflating the self-sufficiency of sinners, unless you really believe, in opposition to Smalley and Edwards and Woods, and in the face of all sound philosophy, (not here to say, of Scripture,) that an evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, *can* bring forth good things;—unless you believe that there is no such law of moral agency as that "every one *must* act his own nature,—otherwise *he* is not the agent."

Edwards is another, with whom you glory to agree. See, then, how his views bear on the point in question. He says, "So long as a prior inclination possesses the will, and is not removed, it *binds* the will, so that it is UTTERLY IMPOSSIBLE that the will should act otherwise than agreeably to it. *Surely* the will CANNOT act or choose contrary to a remaining prevailing inclination of the will. It is equally *impossible* for the will to choose contrary to its own remaining and present preponderating inclination, as it is to prefer contrary to its own present preference, or choose contrary to its own present choice." To this I invite your particular attention. Does not a prior inclination possess the will of the *sinner*, which is not removed? Then, according to Edwards, "it *binds* the will, so that it is *utterly impossible* that" he should choose holiness, or otherwise than agreeably to his perverse inclination. And if it is utterly impossible, surely he *cannot do it*, has no power to do it, and God does "require of men what they have no power to do," while unrenewed. Indeed, Edwards says, "A great degree of habitual wickedness may lay a man under an inability to love and choose holiness; and render him *utterly unable* to love an infinitely holy being, or to choose and cleave to him as his chief good." This is found in Edwards' Works, only one page from the passage quoted in your Letter to Dr. Harvey. Please interpret that passage in the light of this, and the whole scope of his Treatise on the Will. Again, he speaks of the truly holy and spiritual exercises of believers thus, "They differ vastly in their *nature* and *kind* from all that a natural man *can* be the subject of, while he remains in a natural state; and also from all that of which men or devils can be the authors of." He says, there is in the renewed soul "a new sort of conscious exercises which the soul knew nothing of before, and which *no improve-*

*ment, composition, or management of what it was before* COULD *produce.*" The substance of this, he repeats many times and in a very forcible manner, in his Treatise on the Affections. If you can subscribe to this, the point must be settled that the sinner has *no power* to produce those spiritual and holy affections which God requires, in the *first mode*, or while unrenewed.

Will you now take the other horn of the dilemma, and say that the sinner can regenerate himself? Perhaps you mean to intimate this when you say that, "according to Edwards, a man has natural ability to do a thing when he can do it if he wills. And surely a man can have a willing mind if he wills; for as Edwards says, "the willing is the doing. When once he has willed, the thing is performed." Whether, or not, you mean here to intimate that according to Edwards, and according to truth, a man can originate in himself a willing mind or a holy heart, by a possible volition or choice of his own, without grace; it is certain that you must in consistency maintain this, or abandon your doctrine. Let this then be the question; can the sinner, without grace, first regenerate himself, and then do all that God requires? Has he who is *dead* in sin, any power in himself to start up from his state of utter spiritual death, and stand forth a new and perfect creature, in the holy image of God? Has he any power thus perfectly to deliver himself "from the body of this death," and to originate in himself this transcendently excellent, divine, and blessed life? Has he any power perfectly to "put off the old man," and "put on the new man," creating it *himself*, "after God, in righteousness and true holiness?" Can the dead sinner thus mightily, yes, *Almightily*, work in himself" according to the power which worketh in "God's elect, for their spiritual resurrection from the dead?—Ans. "God does not require of men what they have no power to do."

But, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," sounds forth from the mouth of Jehovah. *Can* the sinner thus put on the image of God, and *abide* in this state of perfect holiness, "rooted and grounded in love," and put forth continually accordant exercises and acts, exhibiting in perfection, all the fruits of the Spirit, which are "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance?" This is the character, and these the exercises and fruits, which God requires. And *how* can the unregenerate sinner effect all this, without grace? How can he,

in the first place change his spiritual state? By what power can he rise from spiritual death, shake off all his moral pollution, and stand forth in a character of divine beauty and loveliness,—a character so perfect, that even God can complacently smile, and say, "In thee I behold my own perfect image, and require no more?" This character God requires, and if the sinner has *any power* to produce it, without grace, will you tell me what it is? Such a character is *full* of moral strength for holy exercises; but the sinner can exert *no* moral strength in producing it, for he *has* none, by your own admission. No "disposition to get a right disposition"—no "moral ability to overcome his moral inability." How then can he produce in himself a character, in which there is a *fullness* of moral strength, for the perfect discharge of every duty? Can he do it by his mere natural power, exerted at the very time when his heart is "*full of evil*," and "*fully set in him to do evil?*" But what can *move* his natural power to produce such a holy product? Not his *heart* surely, which is as above. But, according to Dr. Smalley, and Edwards, and the whole host of sound philosophers, "every one *must* act his own nature and choice;" "*must* act according to his own heart," "otherwise—*he* is not the agent." This "is the very thing in which all free agency consists." Who then is the agent, or the possible agent, in this possible act, by which the sinner's natural power regenerates himself? Or is this possible act an *involuntary* one, for which no moral agent is needed? Such an act it must be, since it can be prompted by no moral power. Is it possible then, for a sinner to regenerate himself and stand forth in all the beauty of perfect holiness, by an act which is entirely involuntary! Suppose he should; by what power is he to *abide* in that state, and fulfil the law? His new and self-made holiness must need *some* power to sustain it, for I suppose no creature can have a perfectly independent and self-sustaining holiness, a holiness absolutely independent of all power without him or within him. No *grace* must operate here, for you exclude it from the power which you defend. What power then, has the sinner, or self-regenerate, back of his new-made holiness, by which to sustain it? Not moral power, for there is none there. Is it natural power? What can move it to this constant exertion? Not his self-originated moral strength, for how to sustain *that*, is the very problem. What can move his natural power to this constant exertion?

What? Echo answers, what? *Can* it operate? Then the action must be entirely *involuntary!* Still more, it must be *absolutely without cause!* Here then, is the issue, the inevitable issue of all that boasted *power* of men to do what God requires without grace. We have traced the chain to its first link, and there is *none*, NONE. We have traced the stream to its fountain, and *where is it?* WHERE? This *world* of *power*, stands on an elephant; the elephant stands on a broad-backed turtle; and *where does the turtle stand?* Will you tell? When you can get a clear idea of that peculiar animal, supposed by Edwards to have been described by a traveller, as found in Terra-del-Fuego, then, and not before, I think you may have some clear idea of a *power* by which sinners can do all that God requires without grace.

But possibly you may not yet be willing to retract your doctrine that they *can* do it; that "God does not require of men what they have no power to do." You may still cling to the opinion, that the sinner has at least *natural* power, some how, to regenerate himself, and then do all that God requires. I cannot hope then, to convince you by the light of philosophy, unless it can be done the better, by letting it shine from the minds of men, who, you think, plainly held the same views with yourself. Dr. Woods is one. He says, "Can one who is destitute of holiness produce holiness in himself, or make himself holy by any exertion of his natural power?" After showing in a page or two that all experience, as well as Scriptnre, leads to a negative conclusion, he adds, "Those rational faculties which constitute the natural ability of sinners, and all the ability which they have, are not at all *adapted* to overcome the alienation of their hearts and turn them to a life of holy obedience. What is called the natural ability of sinners is not *fitted* to such a purpose—it has no tendency or aptitude to produce such an effect. As the natural power of sinners, however great, is entirely under the control of their selfish and wicked hearts, it *can never* bring them to any holy affection or act. Take reason and conscience and self-love, and all the powers and dispositions of the unsanctified sinner,—take them either separately or together, and there is no more *adaptedness* or *tendency* in them to change the depraved heart and originate holy love, than there is in a bad tree to produce good fruit, or in an impure fountain to send forth pure waters."

Much more might be quoted from the same pages, (147-8-9 and 100 of vol. II.) of substantially the same import. The very next words I cannot forbear to add, "Take care then, how and for what purpose you speak to sinners of their natural power."—Dr. Smalley says of sinners, "If they have an evil heart of unbelief; wholly inclined to depart from the living God; such a heart will effectually and forever "turn them aside, so that they *cannot* deliver their soul." Nor would better natural abilities be of the least service to them. If ever they come to good, it *must be* by strength that is under a better *direction* than theirs is. Greatness of capacity has not the *least tendency* to produce goodness in one who is altogether destitute of it. Sinners of the most exalted genius and strength of mind, are certainly *no more able* to make themselves new creatures than the very weakest are." "If mankind have lost the moral image of God entirely, it is easy to see that nothing short of a *new creation can* restore it to them. If they are *dead* in trespasses and sins, the quickening them *must be* an instance of the working of *God's mighty power*, in a supernatural manner, like that of raising Christ from the dead." If this is true, surely sinners have no power to quicken themselves.

Says Pres. Edwards, "The power of the enmity of natural men against God, is so great that it is insuperable by any finite power. It has too great and strong a possession of the heart, to be overcome by any created power. Natural men *cannot* overcome their own enmity, let them strive never so much with their own hearts." "Grace in the hearts of the saints being the most glorious work of God, wherein he communicates of the goodness of his nature, it is doubtless his *peculiar* work, and in an eminent manner *above the power of all creatures*." Such is the decision to which we are led by all sound Christian philosophy. We have now seen that the sinner has *no power*, of himself, to perform spiritual duties as God requires. He cannot do it in either of the modes which I have suggested, and these are all the modes of which it is possible to conceive. We have tried both horns of the dilemma, and neither of them will support your doctrine, that every moral agent can do all that God requires without grace.

Let us now briefly test its truth by Scripture. "*Can* the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good, who are accustomed to do evil." There is as absolute an impossibility in the latter case, as in the former. You

may say, and say truly, that the latter is a *moral* impossibility, while the former is a *natural* one. But the obvious sentiment of the passage is, that it is as absolutely impossible for those who are accustomed to do evil, to do good, in their own strength, as it is for the Ethiopian to change his skin, or the leopard his spots. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed *can* be. So then they that are in the flesh *cannot* please God." If this is so, sinners have *no power* to please God. You may say it is a *moral* inability. Let it be so, it is *absolute*, and the sinner has *no power*, natural or moral by which he can overcome or remove it. If he had, he could come to Christ of himself. But Christ says, "No man *can* come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him." Ah! but this again, is *only* a *moral* inability. True, it is moral. But it is as *absolute*, and *invincible* as any natural inability. It *is* natural, in the sense of having its cause in the sinner's very *nature*, morally considered. "By *nature* (Φύσει) children of wrath." You saw that this text was a direct contradiction of your statement of doctrine, and tried to get it out of your way. But you have not succeeded. It is a stubborn thing which will not yield so easily. You say, "And when our Saviour says, "No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him," his meaning is the same as when he says, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." Why then did he not *say* the same? The *words* are certainly very unlike in the two cases. And I cannot believe that he means no more in the former case, than in the latter. In the latter, he simply states the *fact* that the sinner *will not* come to him;—that he *is* unwilling. But he does not here tell us whether this fact is, or is not, *invincible* by any power of the sinner. "Whereas there is as *real*, and as *absolute* an *impossibility* in this case, as in any supposable case whatever." (Smalley.) This is just what the Saviour says in the former text, "No man *can* come." That is, he cannot *will*. "For as Edwards says, the willing is the doing. When once he has willed, the thing is performed." (Dr. Tyler.) Therefore if in this case, "To ascribe the non-performance to *the want of power or ability* is not just, because the thing wanting is not a being *able*, but a being *willing*," then the Lord Jesus Christ himself, has done what is not just, for he has certainly said "No man is *able*." (δύναται.) "And," in the words of Dr. Woods, "I desire you to take par-

ticular notice, that the inspired writers do not teach this truth in a timid, hesitating manner, as though they were afraid that what they were saying might not be quite true, or might mean too much. They assert it *boldly* and *emphatically*. Nor is it a thing which they teach indirectly or by implication merely. They teach it *directly*, and in *so many words*. And they maintain it *constantly* and uniformly, when they have occasion to speak on the subject. They do not say at one time that unrenewed sinners cannot believe in Christ and cannot obey his commands, and at another time that they can. As to that inability of which they speak, and" (notice this,) "*which properly belongs to the subject*, they always teach the same thing, declaring repeatedly that sinners *cannot* obey, and never intimating the contrary." "If the declarations of Scripture, that unrenewed men cannot obey the divine law, and cannot come to Christ unless the Father draw them, are misunderstood — it is our duty carefully to explain them. But how can any one think, that *contradicting* the word of God is the right way to explain it? Who can suppose that we explain the passage, John 6 : 44, by saying, in direct contradiction to the declaration of Christ, that sinners *can* come to him without being drawn of the Father?" This is significant, and coming from Dr. Woods, with whom you profess to agree, you will doubtless heed it. Now, if your explanation of the above passage, taken in connexion with your doctrine, does not directly *contradict* the declaration of Christ, I cannot see how it could possibly be done. Suppose you should explain, on the same principle as above, the Apostle's declaration, that the carnal mind *cannot* be subject to the law of God, and say, he only means *will* not, &c. Why then does he add, "neither indeed *can* be"? Your doctrine and principle of interpretation entirely take away the *cannot*, so "constantly and uniformly," "directly," "boldly and emphatically" asserted by the inspired writers, and only leave the *will not*, which is *no inability*, because sinners "*can* have a willing mind" and do all that God requires. Beware, My Dear Sir, how you "take away from the words of the book" of God! I am much younger than you, but even a child may, with all due respect and affection, caution his father, if he sees him in danger. How carefully have you every where avoided the word *cannot* in your discourse, even in the *moral* sense, except in immediate connexion with a few texts of Scripture, which contain it and com-

pelled you to use it! When you have used it even in such cases, you have quickly laid it aside, and used *will not* in its place. See an instance of this in the closing sentence of the body of your Discourse, on page 16. Were you afraid to say that nothing short of the Almighty energy of the Holy Spirit *can* subdue the sinner's aversion to duty! Jeremiah was not afraid to say "*Can* the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, who are accustomed to do evil." Paul was not afraid to say, "So then, they that are in the flesh *cannot* please God." Our Saviour was not afraid to say and repeat in the same chapter, "No man *can* come unto me except it were given unto him of my Father." He was not afraid to say even to the regenerate, "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, *no more can* ye, except ye abide in me." Of this passage, Dr. Woods gives the sense truly, thus, "Ye are no more able, without help from me, to bear the fruits of holiness, than a branch is able to bear fruit when separated from the vine. This is the precise sentiment conveyed by the words of Christ." And what can be more *absolutely impossible*, than for a branch to bear fruit, when separated from the vine? Is it not true that it has *no power* to do this? *No more* then, can the regenerate or unregenerate of themselves, do *any thing* spiritually good. And Christ says, without me, ye *can do nothing*."

What then becomes of your doctrine, as I have stated it, every moral agent can do all that God requires, without the aid of divine grace? What becomes of it, as you have stated it, "God does not require of men what they have no power to do?" What becomes of your appeal "But, my hearers, can you feel that it would be right for God to require of you what you have absolutely no power to do? Can any rational creature in the universe feel that it would be right?" What, short of *blasphemy*, does it become, if we take the sentiment which the words legitimately convey? What becomes of that other appeal and declaration, "Does God punish his creatures eternally for not doing what they have *no* power to do? Who can believe this to be the character of God? Were such an opinion of his character to prevail throughout his dominions, every angel would drop his harp, and veil himself in sackcloth, and the whole universe would be filled with mourning, lamentation and wo"? What becomes of your bold question, "What sincerity can there be in these invitations

and entreaties" (of the gospel) "if men have no more power to turn from sin to holiness than they have to control the elements?" What becomes of all this, if men can of themselves, *no more* bear holy fruit, than a branch can bear fruit when separated from the vine?—if without Christ, they can do *nothing?* I certainly need not quote any more passages to prove that your doctrine *cannot stand* in the light of Scripture. I have before proved that it will not bear the light of philosophy, and since it will bear neither, will you not abandon it forever? It is possible that one or two objections to this course may still remain. You are far advanced in life, have long held these views and taught them in high places. But if they are *not true*, as I flatter myself I have shown, certainly you are not too old nor too wise and good to abandon them, and to do what you can to counteract their influence.

But if you have erred, you think you have erred in good company. You "do not think it just to the character of the best men who ever occupied the pulpits of New England, to intimate that the language in which they expressed their theological views was such as necessarily teaches great and dangerous errors." Upon this point I have two remarks.

First. These men were not infallible. The great question is whether the language referred to is *true*. I have not shrunk from this question, but have examined it as candidly as I am able. To this examination I invite close inspection, and if I have not *proved* that the language is *false*, and dangerous of course, I will thank you, or any one, to point out the fallacy. That some of these men erred in this matter, I have not the slightest doubt. In those respects wherein they did so, they sometimes contradicted Scripture, and sometimes differed practically from one another, and possibly sometimes even from themselves. Look at this from Dr. Nettleton: "They call on sinners to do what they admit to be *absolutely impossible*. The propriety of this, I confess I am unable to see." Compare this with John 6 : 44, and 15 : 4. Also with this from Dr. Smalley: "Whereas there is as *real* and as *absolute* an *impossibility* in this case, as in any supposable case whatever." Which of these two good men was right, Dr. S. *with* Scripture, or Dr. N. *against* Scripture? Compare Catlin with Scripture, and also with Edwards. C. says, "Surely there can be no natural inability, *no insuperable difficulty*, in sinners' casting away their transgress-

ions, and becoming reconciled in heart to the way of salvation by Jesus Christ." Is there no insuperable difficulty in the Ethiopian's changing his skin or the leopard his spots ? E. says, "The power of the enmity of natural men against God, is so great that it is *insuperable* by any finite power. Natural men *cannot* overcome their own enmity, let them strive never so much with their own hearts." Which was right, C. *against* Scripture, or E. *with* Scripture ? Griffin says, "It is *not true* that God requires of sinners more than they are able to perform. It is *not true* that they cannot love God and submit to him." Paul says, "The carnal mind is enmity against God ; for it is not subject to the law of God ; *neither indeed can be*." Which is right, in this bald contradiction, Griffin, or Paul, who spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost ? I do not think Griffin *meant* what he said. But what he *said* is *false*, and shall *we* say it over again ? Even Griffin contradicted it thus, "The fact is, that the heart governs the head, more than the head the heart. The understanding *cannot* reform a selfish heart." "No powers or faculties are causes of such a nature as to account for the difference of moral feeling between Peter and Judas. In the unregenerate, where supreme self-love predominates, the greatest apparent good is *sure* to be wrapt up in self-interest, and the powers which God supports are *as sure* to act under the general control of selfishness. As no light spread upon other objects *can* make them dearer to the selfish man than self, no radiations of truth *can* alter this direction of the powers, until, by an energy *wholly distinct from the faculties* and from truth, the stubborn heart, in view of truth, is all at once *made* to transfer its supreme affection to God." It *was* then, after all, in Griffin's view, "*true* that they" (sinners) "*cannot* love God and submit to him." All the faculties "*cannot* reform the selfish heart." Thus, when good men *say* what is *false*, they will say the opposite one another occasion. Thus they are "doomed to contradict themselves." Even the great Edwards, may possibly have let slip an occasional word, or sentence "like the passage which you quote, which *seems* to favor your doctrine, and which have proved seeds prolific of mischief in New England, by leading men to do what you have done ; and what his practice certainly does not justify, that is, to preach that men are naturally *able* to do all that God requires.

When the truth is, they are naturally—"by nature,"—able to do *nothing* spiritually good without gracious aid.

My second remark is, that you have gone *far beyond*, if not in direct opposition to the prevailing practice of some of the men, with whom you claim agreement. I think the instances are *few* if there are *any*, in which Edwards, or Smalley, or Woods, not to mention more, ever asserted the ability of sinners to obey the divine law, as you have done. I have already furnished considerable evidence that their mode of treating the subject was the very opposite of your own. It would be easy to furnish much more of the same kind were it needful and did my limits permit. To me, it is *marvellous* that you could imagine that your doctrine was in accordance with the general tenor of the writings of these men! The passage which you quote from Dr. Woods, is, I believe, almost the only one which you could find in his entire Works, which would even *seem* to contain your doctrine. And even that would not serve your purpose without violence. The same is true of those you have quoted from Edwards and Smalley. The passage from Dr. Woods, and your treatment of it is especially worthy of notice. After saying that the inability of sinners to love God and obey his law is *real* and *total*, and one which it is exceedingly important to express in preaching, by the word *cannot*, after the manner of the inspired writers, and exceedingly dangerous and hurtful to deny, by the words *can* and *able*, he says, "But you may ask, what is the fault in the preaching just supposed?" Then come the words you quote, "Is there not a sense in which sinners *can* do what God requires? Have they not some kind of *ability?*" He answers, "Yes, they have some kind of *ability*. They are not in *every* sense unable to obey. They have no such inability as excuses or palliates the guilt of disobedience." You stop here and infer "It is plain therefore, that he did not hold that God requires of men what they have *no* power to do." But *he* did not add to "*ability*" that very significant clause—"*to do what God requires*"—as you have done. To stop where he does, in the first sentence, with the word "ability," putting the emphasis upon it, as he does, and only say "they have some kind of *ability*," is far short of saying, as you make him say, that they have some kind of ability *to do all that God requires*. What *he* says is *true*, and no one doubts it. But what *you* say, and make *him* say, is *false*,

and what he most earnestly denied. His second sentence gives no countenance to your doctrine, if you place the emphasis on "*every*" instead of on "unable," as you have done. Who supposes that sinners are in *every* sense unable to obey, when, as he himself repeatedly shows, *every* sense, does not "properly belong to the subject"? He *did* hold that their inability to obey is "*total*," though not of *every kind*. And that is the only point in question. *Total* inability, though of but just one kind, the only kind "which properly belongs to the subject," leaves "*no* power" for this one kind of acts. If "it is plain that he did not hold that God requires of men what they have *no* power to do," why did he say, even of the regenerate, (Vol. II. p. 177.) "They have *no* power, of themselves, to obey the divine commands." "They are not sufficient, of themselves, to do *any thing* spiritually good"? Why did he say substantially the same over and over in his Lectures, times innumerable? Can you explain this mystery? If you will read again his Lectures on this subject, I think you cannot fail to see that you have done him monstrous injustice, in endeavoring to fasten upon him the doctrine of your Discourse. You must have drawn your conclusion upon a very hasty glance.

To Edwards and Smalley you have done a similar, if not equal injustice. But my limits forbid my entering into this. What I have quoted from them must suffice. Admit the single principle laid down by them both, that a man *cannot* act, as a moral agent, contrary to his own *heart*, and then say, "God does not require of men what they have no power to do,'" and you bring down the divine law from its lofty height of purity and spiritual perfection, and make it require no more spirituality of heart and life than can be rendered by one *dead in sin*, which the Bible tells us, is *absolutely nothing*. When you have done this, you may write upon it "Ichabod," for "the glory is departed"! Were God thus to let down his holy law, his moral government would be at an end, and confusion would reign throughout the moral universe, as wild as would be that of the natural,—

> "Should earth unbalanced from her orbit fly,
> Planets and suns run lawless through the sky,
> The ruling angels from their spheres be hurled,
> Being on being wrecked, and world on world,
> Heaven's whole foundations to their centre nod,
> And nature tremble to the throne of God."

And does God after all require of dead sinners no more than they are of themselves able to perform? "Who can believe this to be the character of God? Were such an opinion of his character to prevail throughout his dominions, every angel would drop his harp and veil himself in sackcloth, and the whole universe would be filled with mourning, lamentation and wo." At least, all saints and holy angels would thus mourn; and if any beings were suited, it must be "haters of God," who are not subject to his law, neither indeed can be, and especially "that worst of all beings, who is called the old serpent — the devil."

"But," my dear sir, "it is not so. There is not unrighteousness with God." "He is a righteous Moral Governor." He is infinitely too holy not to require of men who are fallen and dead in sin, more spiritual and holy service than they *can* of themselves perform. The doctrine of your Discourse may be wafted over the land, like thistle seed on the wings of the wind; it may take its seat in every chair of theology in New England, or the world; it may issue forth in poisonous streams from still more numerous pulpits, which shamelessly boast of their Calvinism, or "New England Theology"; it may cut the sinews of strength, and extinguish the very life of a multitude of churches; it may inflate the self-sufficiency of all who go about to establish their own righteousness; it may thus grieve the hearts of many, or at least, of *some*, who deeply feel, and wish all to feel, that when they are *weak*, then are they strong; — who would have all glory in their *infirmities*, that the power of Christ may rest upon them. It may do all this, though some of its advocates "meant not so, neither did their heart think so." But it cannot bring down the divine law from its glorious height, nor remove from it a jot, nor a tittle, nor raise a ripple on the calm surface of the broad ocean of truth. "And I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."

Yours, truly,

IRA CASE.

CLAREMONT, N. H., MARCH 15, 1855.

AN

# ADDRESS

DELIVERED AT CAMDEN, MAINE,

SEPTEMBER 11, 1855.

AT THE EXPIRATION OF HALF A CENTURY FROM THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH IN THAT TOWN.

BY REV. B. C. CHASE,
Pastor of the Church.

---

ALSO,

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE REVIVAL THERE IN THE YEAR 1836;

NAMES OF CHURCH MEMBERS, &c.

---

BOSTON:
PRESS OF T. R. MARVIN, 42 CONGRESS STREET.
1855.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

CAMDEN, OCTOBER 20, 1855.

REV. B. C. CHASE, *Pastor of the First Congregational Church:*

Dear Sir,—Feeling that the Semi-centennial of the organization of this Church was a meeting of great interest, and that the facts, then presented, ought to be preserved in some permanent form, we request a copy of the Address which you delivered on the occasion, that it may be printed for present and future use.

Affectionately yours,

JOSEPH STETSON,
SAMUEL G. ADAMS,
RODOLPHUS BOWERS,
} *Committee of the Church.*

CAMDEN, OCTOBER 20, 1855.

DEA. S. G. ADAMS AND OTHERS, *Committee of the Congregational Church:*

Dear Brethren,—If the cause of Christ and the interests of the Church, can be promoted by the publication of the Address to which you refer, I am happy to comply with your request.

Yours fraternally,

B. C. CHASE.

CAMDEN, OCTOBER 20, 1855.

REV. E. R. HODGMAN:

Dear Sir,—Believing that the cause of Christ may be promoted by the publication of the Sketch of the Revival in this place in 1836, prepared and read by you at the Semi-centennial of the organization of this Church, we request a copy of the same for this purpose.

Yours with respect,

JOSEPH STETSON,
SAMUEL G. ADAMS,
RODOLPHUS BOWERS,
} *Committee of the Church.*

BOSTON, NOVEMBER 17, 1855.

DEA. J. STETSON AND OTHERS, *Committee:*

Dear Brethren,—I accede to your request for a copy of my Sketch, hoping it may do good.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. HODGMAN.

## NOTES OF THE MEETING, &c.

By previous arrangement, the Waldo Conference of Churches met at Camden, September 10, 1855. The next day (the 11th) being the Fiftieth Anniversary of the organization of the Church there, the forenoon was set apart for its commemoration. A meeting for prayer was held at an early hour. The Semi-centennial Address was delivered by the pastor, Rev. B. C. Chase, prayer having been offered by Rev. Mr. Skinner, of Rockport. The discourse was followed by a Sketch of the Revival in 1836. The pastor then read letters from Rev. D. Adams, Rev. J. Sewall, and Rev. N. T. Fay. Remarks were made by Rev. E. F. Cutter, who alluded to the installation of Rev. Mr. Chapman. He stated that Mr. Thurston, of Searsport, who gave the right hand of fellowship, expressed much joy that another pastor was settled in Waldo County, making a three-fold cord not easily broken; Rev. Mr. McKeen, Rev. Mr. Thurston, and Rev. Mr. Chapman being all the Congregational ministers then in the County. Rev. S. Thurston said that his first acquaintance with this Church began at the ordination of Rev. D. Adams. Since his connection with the Searsport Church, Camden has had three pastors, Belfast six, North Belfast two, Brooks and Jackson three, Freedom and Unity three, Prospect three. A few words from Rev. D. Thurston, and prayer by Rev. J. R. Munsell, closed the services in the meeting-house.

The audience then adjourned to the vestry, where a collation had been prepared by the ladies of the Society. After partaking of this, the congregation listened to brief remarks from various persons, the pastor presiding, and calling out the speakers. Rev. S. C. Fessenden, of Rockland, Dea. L. R. Palmer, of Belfast, Rev. C. H. Wheeler, of Warren, Bro. R. Bowers, of Camden, Rev. S. Thurston, Rev. E. F. Cutter, Dea. J. Stetson, and Bro. Jesse Fay, of Camden, took part. This portion of the services truly seemed like the re-gathering of a

Christian family, after a separation of many years. The prevailing spirit was eminently fraternal and Christian. The interest of the occasion culminated in that friendly interchange of thought and feeling. We all felt that it was good to be there. Few, very few of those present, will live to see the close of another half century. But the hope was expressed, that we might meet again in the morning of the resurrection—meet around our Father's throne above, prepared to sing the song of redemption forever.

After the expression of thanks to God, by Rev. J. Eaton, and the singing of the doxology in long metre, the exercises commemorative of the half century were closed.

# ADDRESS.

In referring to the past as connected with the organization and history of the First Congregational Church in Camden, we find no relics of a hoary antiquity. Our oldest is very new, when compared with the monuments upon which is collected the dust of ages. In comparing the past with the present, and looking forth to the future, the number of generations to be spoken of is few; and yet we have here a subject of interest and importance, because it is the history of a portion of the Church of the living God. In what we are doing to-day, we have the example of Moses, Joshua, and others, who often rehearsed the dealings of God with his people, to humble, to instruct, to warn and encourage them in the future.

Much interesting information which may be gathered from the Town Records will be omitted here, as not particularly connected with our present object. We observe, however, in passing, that the first white man who came to Camden, to find here a home, arrived in 1769. The town was incorporated February 17, 1791; but no evangelical church was organized until 1805.*

If we who highly prize the institutions of the gospel, had lived in those days, I fear we should have been sad that so little interest was taken in the public worship of God, and that the preaching of the gospel and the stated means of grace were so little cared for, that for thirty-six years after the settlement of the town and fourteen years after its incorporation, there was here no church or settled ministry.

---

* The town derived its name from Lord Camden, a parliamentary friend of the Colonies in the Revolution. It was the seventy-second town in the State in the order of incorporation—Bangor being the seventy-third. It has two good harbors, and contains 23,500 acres of land.—*Williamson's History of Maine.*

Surely, one element of the old Puritan character was wanting in some of the early settlers, at least; for we find it recorded that in 1794 the town *paid a fine* for not having among them the stated preaching of the gospel, according to the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, under whose jurisdiction we then were. After this time, a small sum, varying from fifty to one hundred dollars, was annually raised by the town for the purpose of employing a minister.

In 1797, the subject of building a meeting-house was agitated in town meeting, and a committee was chosen to select a lot on which to build. In 1798 a vote was passed by the town "to build a meeting-house at the crotch of the roads near the house of Mr. Harrington, provided he will give the lot." This vote was not carried out; perhaps the land on which to build was not given.

In 1800 a meeting-house was built by private individuals, and some attempt was made to settle a minister by the name of Pillsbury. In 1803, Rev. Father Sewall visited Camden, and speaks of it as "containing somewhat more than a hundred families, having a decent meeting-house, but no church of any denomination, and only a few scattering professors." In 1804, Rev. Thomas Cochran commenced preaching here, and gave such general satisfaction that in 1805 the town gave him a call to settle over them in the gospel ministry.

September 11, 1805. Pursuant to letters missive, an Ecclesiastical Council assembled in Camden for the double purpose of forming a Congregational Church and ordaining a minister. In order to show something of the changes which have occurred in the neighboring churches, I give the names of the ministers and delegates composing the Council.

Church in Woolwich, Rev. Josiah Winship, Pastor; Judge Loring and Mr. Fullerton, Delegates.

Church in Atkinson, Rev. Mr. Peabody, Pastor; Mr. Page, Delegate.

Church in Buckstown, Rev. Mighill Blood, Pastor; Capt. Adams, Delegate.

Church in Freeport, Rev. Alfred Johnson, Pastor.

Church in Dresden, Rev. Freeman Parker, Pastor.

Church in Wiscasset, Rev. Hezekiah Packard, Pastor; F. Cook, Delegate.

Church in Warren, Col. Starrett, Mr. Copeland, Delegates.

Rev. J. Winship was chosen moderator, and Rev. H. Packard, scribe. The following persons were then formed into a Congregational Church:

| | |
|---|---|
| Thomas Cochran. | Bathsheba Thorndike. |
| Robert Thorndike. | Elizabeth Hosmer. |
| Joseph Eaton. | Lucy Eaton. |
| David Blodget. | Lucy Blodget. |
| Lewis Ogier. | Mary Keyes. |

After the Church was formed, the Council gave opportunity to them to call and invite Mr. Thomas Cochran to take the charge and oversight of them in the Lord. Having examined the candidate, and being satisfied, the Council proceeded to ordain him as pastor of the church and minister of the town of Camden. The sermon, preached on the occasion by Rev. Mr. Packard, together with the charge by Rev. Mr. Winship, and the right hand of fellowship by Rev. Mr. Blood, was printed—a copy of which is in my possession.

Little is certainly known of the history of the church during the ministry of Mr. Cochran. It appears that there were additions to it, but when, or how many, cannot now be known. Neither is there any record, on the part of the church, of his dismission. I gather this much from the records of the town, that, at the first, the inhabitants all considered themselves members of the Congregational parish, and paid their tax for the support of Mr. Cochran according to law, with the exception of those who notified the town authorities that they belonged to and helped support another denomination.

The salary of Mr. Cochran was five hundred dollars a year, together with the free use of one-third of the ministerial lot; a liberal salary compared with the sum now given by our churches, the difference in the manner and the great increase in the expenses of living being taken into consideration.

After Mr. Cochran had been settled a few years, the great body of the people became dissatisfied, and neglected attendance upon his preaching. It is doubtless true, that the unfortunate and unhappy manner in which he left the place, and the legal proceedings instituted to recover what he considered his due, served to prejudice the minds of some men so much that

they and their descendants have not recovered from it unto this day.

After Mr. Cochran left Camden, which was in 1814, this church was without a settled pastor until 1828, a period of fourteen years. During this time several ministers occupied the pulpit, varying in time from one Sabbath to more than a year. The following are the names of some of them: Rev. Messrs. Sewall, Ingraham, Starrett, Norwood, Sheldon, Howe, Campbell, Bishop, and perhaps others. Some of these were employed in part by the Maine Missionary Society. The whole amount of our indebtedness to that noble society, however, is only about one hundred and thirty-five dollars, which has been repaid many times by the yearly contributions of this church into her treasury.

In June, 1828, the church gave a call to Mr. Darwin Adams* to be their pastor for the specified time of five years. Mr. Adams was ordained July 15, 1828. Rev. Mr. Blood, of Bucksport, was chosen moderator of the Council, Rev. Mr. Wales, of Belfast, was chosen scribe, and Rev. Mr. Mitchell, of Waldoboro', preached the sermon.

Much success appears to have attended the labors of Mr. Adams during the five years of his ministry. In the autumn of 1829, the Lord graciously revived his work in the north part of the town. No other than ordinary means were used, unless some efforts in the cause of temperance, previously made, opened the way for the descent of the Holy Spirit. After there had been a few conversions, Mr. Adams was absent a few weeks, and the revival continued under the labors of Rev. Bennett Roberts. Among other facts of interest connected with this revival, is this: one lady, over *seventy* years of age, was hopefully converted. The work continued for some time, and as the result of it, about *twenty persons* were added to the church.

January 30, 1830, we find the following record: Resolved, That it be recommended to the members of this Church, that they abstain from the use of ardent spirits, except in case of bodily hurt or sickness.

---

* Mr. Adams is a son of Doct. Daniel Adams, formerly of Mount Vernon, N. H. He is a graduate of Dartmouth College and Andover Theological Seminary, and is now pastor of the church in Dunstable, Mass.

November, 1832, the following vote was passed: Resolved, That, from this time, no individual shall be received into this Church as a member, who is unwilling to give the pledge of total abstinence from ardent spirits.

These resolutions mark the position and progress of the cause of temperance in this church, at that time.

July 16, 1833, Rev. Mr. Adams made the following communication to the Church and Congregation:—

My Christian Friends:—

As the period of my settlement has nearly closed, and as there is no provision for a future support,—painful as it is to me to close my labors among you at a time when religion is so low and the cause of Zion languishes, yet Providence seeming to favor my removal,—I feel it a duty to request you to unite with me in calling an Ecclesiastical Council to dissolve the relation now existing between us.

Affectionately yours,

Darwin Adams.

The church accepted this resignation, and Mr. Adams was dismissed. From this time for more than a year, the church was without preaching, except three Sabbaths, when the pulpit was supplied by Rev. Mr. Richardson. The church, however, met on the Sabbath for religious services, and in conference once each month.

In 1834, a new house of worship was built,* and there appeared signs of interest and prosperity.

In January, 1835, the Church and Parish united in extending a call to Rev. Nathaniel Chapman, which was accepted, and Mr. C. was installed August 18, 1835. The Installing Council was unusually large and able, consisting of seventeen persons, among whom were Rev. Messrs. Mitchell, Cutter, Woodhull, McKeen, S. Thurston, Father Sewall, and Rev. Dr. Pond.

It was during this year that the Church and Society purchased a parsonage. We are now approaching the time of peculiar interest—the set time to favor this church—the mem-

* The house was built under the supervision of George Pendleton, Esq., at a cost, it is believed, of $5,000. It was dedicated in January, 1835.

orable revival of 1836. This church has occasion to remember with gratitude other seasons of refreshing, but at this time, it seems, that the windows of heaven were opened. I quote the language of the pastor: —

"February 13, 1836. The church met at the meeting-house for conference and prayer. After much deliberation, with fear and trembling, the church voted to have a protracted meeting." March 1, he again writes: "A series of meetings has commenced this day. No minister present but the pastor. The people attended well, and I preached from Gen. xlii. 36: 'All these things are against me.'" For a fuller account of this revival, I refer you to a sketch prepared by Rev. E. R. Hodgman.

During the ministry of Mr. Chapman, there were some cases requiring discipline. One instance especially shows how even professors of religion may sometimes sell themselves to "play the fool," strengthen the hands of evil doers, and grieve the hearts of the true friends of Christ. It is in vain to palliate or excuse the conduct of such a one when he openly and frequently speaks disrespectfully of his pastor—a man of tried worth and usefulness. What excuse *can* be offered when a faithful and devoted pastor is publicly abused and held up to ridicule, and the church, as a whole, is made a by-word and a hissing by one of its own members, and others, by silence, encourage such a course? It is often painfully evident that some of the most bitter enemies of the church, and the things which most hinder her progress, are to be found among her own nominal members. In the case referred to,—while the action of discipline was decisive and the vote of excommunication *without a negative*, yet it is to be feared there were some, beside the erring member, who secretly favored this unchristian conduct, which, I think, resulted in evil to both people and pastor, because allowed to go on so long unrebuked.

Certain it is that during the remaining part of Mr. Chapman's ministry, there was little revival interest in the church, and few, very few conversions compared with the previous years of his pastorate. During nine years following this sad affair—more than one half of Mr. Chapman's ministry—I cannot find that more than thirteen were added to the church by profession. It will not be for the interest of any church to permit its minis-

ter to be held up to the contempt of the community in which he labors. If he is unsound in doctrine, preaches heresy, is immoral, there are proper steps to be taken; but when, as in the case before us, a minister is faithful and successful, and yet a member of the church in a public meeting makes remarks of the kind found on the church records, success need not be expected. Mr. Chapman was remarkably successful during five years previous to this time, but afterward there was nothing worthy of particular notice. He was dismissed April 10, 1849.

For several months after his dismission, the pulpit was occupied, at different times, by Rev. Messrs. Boyd, Wheelwright, Williams, Snow, and Chase.

In September, 1849, the Church and Parish united in extending a call to Mr. B. C. Chase, a recent graduate of Bangor Theological Seminary. He accepted the call, and was ordained January 8, 1850.

During the spring of 1850, there was an interesting revival, and sixteen persons were added to the church as its fruits. About this time the subject of building a conference-room was agitated. The need of it had long been confessed; and a few individuals were willing to do what was necessary to obtain so desirable an object. By their liberality the building was erected, and by deed from the generous proprietors, became the property of the church, June, 1852.

In 1854, a part of the church resident at a neighboring village, was dismissed, and with others was organized into the Rockport Congregational Church.

During the fifty years thus briefly reviewed, this church has maintained the weekly prayer-meeting on Thursday evening, the female prayer-meeting on Wednesday afternoon, and the monthly church-conference. And it is to these meetings of conference and prayer, that much of the prosperity of the church, under God, is to be attributed.

Individual efforts were early made by its members, in different parts of the town, to establish Sabbath schools. The one immediately connected with the church, has gone on from year to year, increasing in numbers and usefulness. The report of the superintendent for 1854, gives one hundred and seventy-eight as the number connected with the school during the year. There has been some attention paid to the cultivation of a *mis-*

*sionary* spirit among the scholars. About twenty-five dollars a year, for the last few years, have been contributed by them for the purpose of educating heathen children.

There has been manifested a commendable spirit of benevolence by at least a portion of the church, toward missionary and charitable objects. It is impossible to form any correct idea of the amount contributed in former years; but during the last six years, about thirteen hundred dollars, or somewhat more than two hundred dollars each year, have been given, over and above all the necessary expenses of sustaining the means of grace at home.

This church has had four pastors—Rev. Mr. Cochran, nine years; Rev. Mr. Adams, five years; Rev. Mr. Chapman, fourteen years; and Rev. Mr. Chase, six years—leaving sixteen years in which it was destitute of a pastor. The church has had seven deacons, viz: Deacons Blodget, Brown, Start, Stetson, Hodgman, Buchanan, and Adams. Three of these have died, Messrs. Blodget, Brown, and Start. Three members of this church have entered upon the great work of preaching the gospel. Rev. N. T. Fay has been preaching for several years in Northwestern Ohio; Rev. E. R. Hodgman is laboring in Massachusetts; and Rev. C. H. Barrett, having recently finished his studies, intends to devote himself particularly to the benefit of seamen.

The whole number of persons admitted to this church as members from 1805 to 1828, a period of 23 years, is 66. The whole number from 1828 to 1835, a period of 7 years, is 43; whole number from 1835 to 1849, a period of 14 years, is 115; whole number from 1849 to 1855, a period of 6 years, is 44; whole number from 1805 to 1855, a period of 50 years, is 268. The whole number who have died, have been excommunicated or dismissed, is 150; the present number of members is 118.

It is a fact worthy of remark, that one of the *original members* of the church is still with us. After the lapse of fifty years, sister *Lucy Eaton*, having passed through many trials, continues here, truly a mother in Israel. She has the satisfaction of seeing some of her children and children's children united to the same church of which she has so long been a member.

With the foregoing facts before us, it will be seen that this has not been an unfruitful vine. *Work* has been done here, and love manifested to the cause of Christ. It requires no little self-denial and effort to sustain, for half a century, the weekly prayer-meeting and the monthly church-conference. It is no easy labor to carry forward the operations of the Sabbath school. It requires decision, perseverance, and devotion to the cause of Christ, for a few individuals to attend the yearly parish meeting, to serve on committees, and go as delegates to councils, to contribute of their property to sustain the institutions of the gospel at home, and meet the numerous calls of benevolence abroad. It is evident, therefore, that much labor has been performed, many prayers have been offered, and much money has been contributed by this church. And God having heard these prayers, has granted his blessing, and given the increase. The little band of ten individuals, which fifty years ago was organized into a church, has increased and been a blessing to the world, to the glory of God. It is proper, however, to inquire if this church has accomplished all the good intended in its formation, or has fulfilled its mission in the community and the world. We would carry this inquiry up to the great Head of the church. If he should address us on this occasion, as he did the churches of Asia, what would be the message? He has from the very first been perfectly familiar with the history of this church. He has known all the labors and trials of his people here—has seen all their tears—has witnessed the indifference, coldness and backsliding of some; and after all that has been accomplished for him, would he not say to the Congregational Church in Camden, "*I have somewhat against thee?*" In order to obtain the truth in regard to past faithfulness, it will be necessary to glance at the objects contemplated in the organization of a Christian church. These may be included under three heads: 1. The enlargement and perfection of the individual church; 2. The spread of the gospel, until the whole world shall be evangelized; 3. The glory of God.

1. The church should seek her own growth and perfection. It is her duty to grow in grace, in numbers, and usefulness; to lay aside every weight; to forget the things that are behind, and press forward to perfection; to "work out her own salva-

tion with fear and trembling." This end can be attained alone by a working church, where each member is doing his duty.

2. The object of the church is to spread the gospel until the whole world is evangelized. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." "Ye are the light of the world; ye are the salt of the earth." "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works." The church is here directed to evangelize the world by precept and example. It professes to be a company of renewed men supremely devoted to the love of God and man. Hence the members should so exemplify Christianity as to adorn the doctrines they profess. They are not only to send the gospel to pagan nations, but to let the world see, in the effect the gospel has upon their own lives, that it is the wisdom and power of God unto salvation to all who believe it. They are to show to the world a community of regenerated men, living together such holy lives, in brotherly love, that a type of heaven may be seen on earth.

3. The ultimate object of the church is to glorify God. Men, beholding her good works, are to be convinced that the gospel is of divine origin, and then to glorify its Author. The song of the church triumphant in heaven begins on earth, in that living sacrifice which gives glory to God in the highest. All the efforts of the church, then, should be so comprehensive, noble and exalted, that men will be constrained to acknowledge that the great heart and mind of God is speaking and acting through his people. The controlling motive should be, to honor God; and the sentiment of every effort should be, "The Lord our God is a great God." The church should say by word and deed, "We are the servants of the great King of kings—we are doing the work of the Lord God Almighty—we go forward in our enterprises under his direction." If this is the fact in any church, then their labors and prayers will be on such a grand, noble and comprehensive scale, as to give glory to the great Moral Governor of the Universe.

But time will permit us only to glance at this subject. From the few thoughts suggested, all must feel that the church has a mission to accomplish in regard to herself, the world, and the declarative glory of God, which requires the active exercise of all her resources. But her resources are the talents and abili-

ties of her members. No church, therefore, has done its duty, unless every member has done what he can to accomplish the specified objects of its organization. No intelligent Christian will deny that his talents, resources, abilities, property, and influence, are all the Lord's—to be used for the good of the church, the spread of the gospel, and the glory of God. If any man entered the church of God with anything less than this entire consecration, he kept back part of the price and came in with a lie in his right hand. The church is a body; the members are the parts. If every member is active, the body is full of life, and performs the functions of a living church. In order, therefore, to ascertain whether this or any church has been faithful and has the approbation of the Master, we must not only inquire what are the objects of attainment, but whether each member has done all he could. What is the result of a careful examination of individual faithfulness in this church as found written by the recording angel? Assemble the living, let the dead come forth, let each answer for himself before God and his own conscience, whether or not he has been faithful to his solemn vows of consecration.

The true verdict no doubt is, that had each member done his duty, the history of this church for these fifty years would be very different from what it now is. Alas! that no more has been done. Go through our town from village to village, from house to house, and behold the moral desolations after half a century of Christian effort. There are in Camden three Calvinist Baptist churches, one Freewill Baptist church, two Methodist societies, and two Congregational churches; in all, *eight* evangelical churches, and yet how small and inefficient they are, how little has been done to save men and glorify God. How much Sabbath desecration, ungodliness, and profaneness remains! How many prayerless, godless families!

What are these churches doing? Why is not their influence felt more? At this rate how long before the millennium? If after fifty years' labor, so little is accomplished, how long before the kingdom of God will come and his will be done on earth as in heaven?

But we will not dwell too long on the dark side of our history; for we have great occasion to say, "Hitherto the Lord hath helped us," and "He hath done great things for us, where-

of we are glad." We rejoice to know that in the darkest hours of the past, in the days of infancy, under all discouragements, against all opposition, through evil and good report, there has been a band of tried and faithful friends of Christ to pray and labor, and give of their substance to sustain the institutions of religion at home, and extend the same to distant lands. Especially do we unite, with devout gratitude, in ascribing salvation and glory and honor and blessing and power unto God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who, as we trust, planted, and from time to time has watered and blessed this beloved vine.

While we are reviewing the past and enjoying this present Christian re-union, shall we not say a word of what we hope will be the future history of this church? When fifty years shall again have passed and the centennial of our organization shall be celebrated, what shall be the record of labor done, of good accomplished, of souls saved, and God glorified? Can we bear the thought that this church shall grow old in energy, have a name to live while it is dead, and finally cease to be, as many others have done? Ah, no, we hope for better things. We believe that too many prayers have been offered for such a sad day to come. Suppose we had this day been organized. Suppose that each of our one hundred and eighteen members feels and manifests a deep interest in the prosperity of the church; that we have a house of worship, a chapel, a flourishing Sabbath school, a good choir of singers, a settled pastor. Suppose, I say, that a new church is this day organized with all the resources we possess, how much good should we expect would be accomplished. But ought not an old church which God has blessed, to do as much as a young one?

Earthly things must grow old, wear out and decay, but not so with a Church of Christ. "They who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint."

If we return unto the Lord, repent of our unfaithfulness, dedicate ourselves anew to his service, we shall receive a fresh baptism of the Holy Ghost, and thus obtain new life, new energy, new enterprise; devise more liberal things for the welfare of Zion and redouble our diligence for the prosperity of the cause of Christ. It is needful that we should repent, return

unto our first love, and do the first works, for the time is short.

Brethren and sisters, if we would see this beloved church prosper, God glorified, and souls saved—if at the last, as individuals, we would say, as did our divine Lord and Master, "*I have glorified thee on the earth, I have finished the work thou gavest me to do; and now, holy Father, I come to thee*"—we must, we *must* gird on the whole armor of God, stand in our lot, and fight the good fight of faith. May each one of us have grace to do his duty.

And now, as we sit here, memory, quickened by the facts here presented, is no doubt busy with the past. Some of you look around in vain for the familiar faces of many whose voices you were wont to hear in prayer or exhortation. *All are not here to-day.* We are in one sense a divided band.

> "Part of the host have crossed the flood,
> And part are crossing now."

But let there be a re-union on this occasion. Let the departed, the sainted fathers and mothers, the companions of former trials, come, at least in imagination, and sit with us, occupying once more their accustomed places. *Oh! let us feel that we are one—one with the living—one with the great company of believers in heaven and on earth—one with God through Christ!* "*Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.*"

# BRIEF SKETCH OF THE REVIVAL IN CAMDEN

## IN THE YEAR 1836.

(BY REV. E. R. HODGMAN.)

---

THIS forms a memorable epoch in the history of this church. It began in the month of March, and in its greater and lesser developments, continued through the Spring and following Summer. For some time previous, the church as a whole had been cold and inactive. Symptoms of revived interest on the part of some, began to appear during the Autumn and Winter. The most obvious and encouraging of these were to be seen among the *sisters* of the church. They sustained a meeting among themselves on Wednesday afternoons. The testimony of those who attended it, reveals the fact that an unusual spirit of prayer prevailed among them. They also contributed not a little to the interest of the meeting on Thursday evenings, which was then held in private rooms, and at which, I am told, only two of the brethren could be relied upon to take any active part.

During that winter, various kinds of iniquity were rife in the village; the young, especially, were much given to fashionable amusements. The public mind seemed to be occupied with those things which hinder the truth and tend *unto more ungodliness.* In contrast with these discouraging tokens, the fact should be stated, that some Christians were clinging to the hope and the belief that God was about to revive his work; and it was known that here and there an individual was attentively considering the great question of personal salvation. These things, together with a disposition to persevere, stimulated the desire for a protracted meeting. But when the proposition was actually made to have one, some of the church hesitated; others opposed the measure, on the ground that if it *failed*, the failure would be *disastrous.* Comparatively few gave it a hearty support, and had faith that God would bless such an instrumentality. When the pastor had made the preliminary arrangements, there came a movement of perplexity and trial. The want of faith occasioned many misgivings. The whole plan seemed likely to be frustrated. At this juncture, a few of the sisters resorted to the throne of grace, and being themselves

encouraged by prayer, they stayed up the hands of their minister. Words of cheer, sent to him after their little meeting one Saturday evening, greatly strengthened his heart, and he determined to proceed.

The meeting opened on the first day of March. Outwardly, its very commencement seemed inauspicious. A sudden thaw made the walking very bad, and a strong wind rendered exposure out of doors quite unpleasant. When the people came together, no minister from abroad had arrived. Yielding to the necessity, the pastor preached from the text, "All these things are against me." A neighboring minister—Rev. E. F. Cutter, then of Warren—arrived in season to occupy the pulpit in the afternoon. His text was, Matt. xiii. 58—"*And he did not many mighty works there, because of their unbelief.*" The sermon contained a fervid and earnest appeal to professing Christians to put away unbelief, and prepare for the coming of the Lord.

As the meeting progressed, the interest deepened. But so far as I can learn or remember, no meeting for personal inquiry was held until the fourth or fifth day. The number who attended the first meeting of this kind, was unexpectedly large; and from that time onward, none could doubt the presence of the Holy Spirit. The meeting became exceedingly solemn. The attention of the audience was riveted upon the preacher. The truths of the Bible came home to the heart and conscience *with power*. God blessed the promulgation of them, so that, in some instances, conviction of sin immediately followed. The preaching, both in matter and style, was eminently practical and evangelical. It was plain and pointed; in the judgment of some it was *severe*. But it was remarkable that its severity was generally *acquiesced in*, as all just and right; and it led the convicted mind to cry out in anguish, "*What must I do to be saved?*" There was a degree of self-application in the hearers seldom witnessed. Each seemed to feel that every rebuke, and warning, and exhortation, was meant *for him*. Occasionally, the utterance of some awful truth startled the sinner, and roused up all the latent opposition of his heart to God; as when, for example, the sovereignty of Jehovah was dwelt upon, or when, in portraying the wickedness of the natural heart, it was affirmed that the sinner would, if he could, dethrone the Almighty, and reign alone. Such outbursts of depravity were followed, in some cases, by the speedy conversion of the soul; in others they proved the turning-point at which the sinner resolutely, and we fear, *finally*, rejected the offer of pardon.

The testimony of the pastor is in the following words: "Conviction of sin was *deep*, and those who indulged hope were humbled. Some of the most unpromising subjects, as to human appearance, were

brought to a knowledge of the truth, and others who, as far as we can see, appeared most hopeful, passed through the revival without hope."

Rev. S. McKeen says: "I remember the revival in Camden with great interest. It was distinguished for an all-pervading and overawing sense of the real presence of God. The ministers who preached there, felt that they were speaking by his authority, and aimed to be as plain and faithful as possible—dwelling exclusively on those vital truths of the gospel which bear directly on the conversion of the soul to God. Much fervent prayer was offered by the people of God; for without the almighty energy of his Spirit, we all felt that means would be of no avail. And the result was, that God glorified himself in turning a goodly number from death to life everlasting." Mr. McKeen speaks of the spirit of prayer which prevailed. Sometimes the importunity of Christians was so marked as to attract particular notice. At one time, about one hundred and fifty inquirers were assembled in this house. The church met at the brick schoolhouse. The pastor, seeing the number here, went to tell the church and encourage them to pray. I remember the expression of his countenance, when he left and when he returned. At another meeting for inquirers, Mr. McKeen made a very urgent appeal from the words, "*Will ye also be his disciples?*"—emphasizing each word in succession. Both those occasions were exceedingly moving and solemn.

The meeting continued *eleven days*. It would be difficult to say which of those days, after the fourth or fifth, was most signalized by the presence and power of the converting Spirit. We who date our hope of pardon and reconciliation to God from that eventful period, can some of us fix upon one day, and some upon another. And so in regard to particular sermons that were blessed to the awakening of sinners. One from the text, "This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them," and one from the words, "Acquaint now thyself with him, and be at peace; thereby good shall come unto thee," both by Rev. D. M. Mitchell, are remembered as very appropriate and solemn. So also one from 2 Kings v. 11—14, relating to Naaman the Syrian, and one from Zec. iv. 6, by Rev. E. F. Cutter. Some discourses seemed to be employed as the *direct* means of bringing souls to Christ. One in which the excuses and objections of the impenitent were met and answered, preached by Mr. McKeen, is gratefully remembered by at least *one* mind. Another by him from the words in Isaiah, "Wo unto him that striveth with his Maker," produced a marked effect. But perhaps the one which was most signally blessed, was one that he preached from 1 Chron. xxix. 5, "Who then is willing to consecrate his service this day unto the Lord?" There were some who gave

themselves to Christ during its delivery. Some will remember what interest and solemnity pervaded the little gatherings of young converts in private rooms; what joy was experienced when certain individuals were hopefully converted, and what reluctance we felt when the closing session was held. Some, too, will recollect the little meeting of the converts at the pastor's house, when Mr. McKeen so tenderly addressed them and so fervently commended them to God in prayer.

The closing appeal was made by Rev. Mr. Mitchell from the text, "Choose you this day whom you will serve." But the work did not cease when the series of public meetings ended. It continued with power. Out of the whole number who gave themselves to God during this Pentecostal season in Camden, comparatively few cherished hope during the eleven days; but many minds could be found, in every stage of interest and feeling, from transient thoughtfulness up to incipient hope. In a record made at the time it is said, "Some faintly indulge the hope that they have submitted to Christ." The little band of disciples gradually increased by additions of two or three each week. The enemies of the cross cast many aspersions upon the pastor and the church, but divine grace triumphed over all. The state of religious feeling in the town during the spring and summer was very interesting. Some will recollect the prayer meeting of the young converts on Wednesday evenings. I see many here to-day who were accustomed to attend them. They were delightful seasons. The weekly meeting in the *north* neighborhood should be noticed in this review. We miss from our gathering to-day the officer of the church, (Dea. Start,) who conducted it. He, with many others, including his entire family, has since gone to his rest. The influence of that meeting was very great in determining the *type of piety* which those who sustained it, should afterward exhibit.

There are many personal reminiscences, many items gathered from conversations with others, which I should be glad to embody in this sketch, but which I am constrained to omit. This must be regarded as a mere outline of that wonderful achievement of God's grace. How many, in all the religious societies here, did then truly consecrate themselves to God, I have never sought to determine precisely. The first fruits were gathered into this church five months after, when *fifty-six* persons made solemn profession of their faith in Christ. *That day, August 7, 1836, will never be forgotten by some of us.* The scene at the baptism, in the forenoon, was very impressive. Some thirty persons or more,—the others having been baptized in infancy,—passed up one aisle, across the altar, receiving the rite from the pastor, and then passed down the other aisle. And in the afternoon, when all that large company stood up to take the vows of God upon them, and

the church arose to welcome this great accession,—more than doubling its numbers,—there were many moistened eyes and beating hearts in this house. Parents welcomed their children, and children their parents, to the fold of the good Shepherd. It was a scene, we think, that made angels glad, and the Redeemer then saw some fruit gathered to recompense his mortal agony on the cross.

*That revival was a work of great solemnity and power.* Nothing like it has occurred in this place during the half century we now commemorate. *It was a genuine work.* "A remarkable fact," says the pastor, Rev. N. Chapman, "in relation to this revival, which goes to show its genuineness and magnify the grace of God, is, that *all* who made a profession as the *fruits* of the work, as far as I have known, *have persevered and held out, and to my personal knowledge many of them had special aid in the day of their death.*"

*Its magnitude* exceeded the faith and even the hopes of God's people. It was more than they looked for; and the abundance of the blessing produced humility and devout thankfulness.

In its origin and progress, it was very manifest *that the efficiency was of God.* The church was taught not to despise the day of small things, and not to limit the power and grace of the Saviour. Persons were strangely drawn to that meeting who had decided not to go. Instances are remembered of some arrested at their work, compelled to suspend it and go to the sanctuary. *Its effect upon the church was very salutary.* The standard of piety was elevated. Old jealousies and alienations were removed. A tender spirituality prevailed. Loftier views of God were entertained. The habit of prayer was greatly strengthened. Love for the souls of men was much increased, and showed itself in personal efforts for their salvation.

It was a work of *vast significance* in the estimation of this whole community. The pastor says, "The attention of all classes seemed called to the subject of religion; the business of the place was in a great measure suspended; the mouths of gainsayers were stopped, and all seemed affected by divine truth to a greater or less degree. Some persons from abroad were awakened in Camden at the time, and afterwards obtained hope and made profession of religion in other places. All who came into the meetings, whether strangers or inhabitants of the town, were ready to exclaim, "*Surely, the Lord is in this place.*"

*It reflected infinite honor upon God, and displayed in a most remarkable manner the sovereignty of his grace and the omnipotence of his power, the holiness of his nature and the tenderness of his compassion.* In many a case there was "the hiding of his power," but the sweet revelation of his love. The angels rejoiced in it, and praised him in

louder strains because of it. And some who were then converted, and have since gone home to heaven, are now praising him for that wonderful interposition. Some thirteen or fourteen of that number have died; and we who remain, are hoping soon to join them. Oh, if we shall be accepted in Christ and admitted to heaven, how fervently shall we adore him for his free grace and undeserved mercy!

"When God makes up his last account
Of natives in his holy mount,
T' will be an honor to appear,
As one new-born or nourished there."

NAMES OF THE OFFICERS AND MEMBERS

OF THE

# FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

IN

# CAMDEN, MAINE,

FROM ITS ORGANIZATION IN 1805 TO 1855.

## PASTORS.

| Settled. | | Dismissed. |
|---|---|---|
| 1805 | Rev. Thomas Cochran, | 1814 |
| 1828 | Rev. Darwin Adams, | 1833 |
| 1835 | Rev. Nathaniel Chapman, | 1849 |
| 1850 | Rev. Benjamin C. Chase. | |

## DEACONS.

David Blodget
William Brown
Ebenezer Start
Joseph Stetson
Joel Hodgman
Archibald Buchanan
Samuel G. Adams

## MEMBERS.

(Rev.) Thomas Cochran
Robert Thorndike
Joseph Eaton
(Dea.) David Blodget
Lewis Ogier
Bathsheba Thorndike
Elizabeth Hosmer
Lucy Blodget
Lucy Eaton
Mary Keyes

Joseph Waterman
Joshua Thomas
Solomon Keyes
Thomas Mansfield
William Mansfield
(Dea.) William Brown
Abisha Read
—— Atham
Thomas Mansfield, Jr.
Jonathan Thayer
Rebecca Thorndike
Lucy G. Waterman
Sarah Brown
Rhoda A. Martin
Huldah Dillingham
Lucy Hanford
Hannah Mansfield
Betsey Start
Mary Howe
Mehitable Barnes
Ephraim Barrett
(Dea.) Ebenezer Start
Jesse Fay
Frye Hall
Joseph Jones
Daniel Melvin
William S. Prichard
(Dea.) Joseph Stetson
Moses Aucott
Jonathan Merriam
(Dea.) Archibald Buchanan
(Rev.) Darwin Adams
Ezra Cobb
Jonah Howe
Seth Stone
Elisha Mansfield
Rachel Palmer
Relief Mansfield
Anna E. Fay
Maria Mansfield
Clarissa Stone
Mary Ann Gould
Keziah Hartshorn
Sarah McLaughlin
Polly Beverage
Sophia Merriam

Wilder B. Start
Rodolphus Bowers
Mary Harrington
Mary Wadsworth
Margaret Russ
Deborah Hathaway
Deborah Eaton
Lois Mayo
Lucy Fay
Hannah Ring
Mary Black
Eliza Hall
Rebecca Pike
Catherine H. Adams
Nancy Bartlett
Nancy Hosmer
Emma Dillingham
Bitha Fogler
Maria Mansfield
Sophia Fay
Frederic B. Fay
(Rev.) Nathaniel T. Fay
William Harrington
Daniel Mansfield
Newell Mansfield
Newell Mansfield, Jr.
Samuel P. Ingraham
Frederic Conway
Sarah Simonton
Margarett Jacobs
Sarah Hobbs
Susannah Brown
Thankful Mayo
Jane Cushing
Mary Ingraham
Jane Eaton
Betsey E. Start
Silence Mansfield
Fanny Prescott
Mary Hodgman
Elsa B. Mansfield
Lydia Hosmer
Nancy Perry
Huldah Hobbs
Hannah Melvin
Nancy Parkman

Mary Mansfield
Susannah Start
Susan Brown
Isabella Annis
Mary Kaler
Susan W. Pendleton
Ruth McLaughlin
Lois Russell

[Admitted August 7, 1836.]

(Dea.) Samuel G. Adams
Adeline C. Adams
Lucy Barnes*
Lucy Barrett*
Clarissa Bass
Betsey Carleton
William Carleton, Jr.
Phebe Carleton*
Clementine P. Connor
Ruth Curtis
Abigail Cushing
Sarah G. Cushing*
Mary Ann Durant
Nathaniel T. Eaton
Deborah H. Eaton
Lucy Eells
Nancy Fay
Silas G. Fay
Lucy R. Fay
Maria M. Fay
Edward Hanford*
Mary P. D. Hanford
Lovisa Harrington
Eunice Heal
(Dea.) Joel Hodgman
(Rev.) Edwin R. Hodgman
Sarah E. Hodgman
Charles Hosmer
Nathaniel Hosmer, Jr.
Eliza Hosmer
Sarah Hosmer*
Jonas Howe
Julia Jacobs
Mary Ann Jones*
George W. Kaler
Dorothy Loring
Joel Mansfield
Lydia W. Mansfield*
Arena Mansfield
Relief C. Mansfield
Nancy Mansfield
Sarah E. Mansfield
Jane Mansfield
S. Adelaide Mirick*
William Merriam
Angelica Parker
Mehitable B. R. Perry*
Warren Rawson*
Lucy H. G. Rawson
Auriann Russell
Joseph C. Stetson
Harriet Stetson
William Start*
Sophronia Start*
Sophia Thayer
Nancy Withington

[Admitted since August 7, 1836.]

Lucy C. Adams
Caroline A. Barnes
Charles Barnes
(Rev.) Charles H. Barrett
Harriet Barrett
Susan Barrett
Ann Bell
John Bell
Joseph Bowers
Louisa B. Bowers

* Deceased.

Elizabeth S. Buchanan
Lydia J. Buchanan
Sarah Buchanan
John Bullock
Josephus Bump
Nancy Bump
James S. Carleton
(Rev.) Nathaniel Chapman
Sarah P. Chapman
Almeda S. Chase
(Rev.) B. C. Chase
Betsey Cobb
George W. Cobb
William H. Codman
Maria Conant
Matilda W. Drinkwater
Elizabeth H. Dodge
Luther Dodge
Lucy H. Eaton
Nancy P. Eaton
Achsah D. Fay
John Fay
Elisha Gilkey
Martha Gilkey
Lucy J. Glover
Amasa B. Gould
Mary Gould
Mary Adeline Gould
Catharine Harbach
Elizabeth Harbach
Mary Harbach
Thomas Harbach
Thomas S. Harbach
Harriet Harrington
Ebenezer Hobbs
Albert H. Hodgman
Betsey Hodgman
Elizabeth K. Hodgman
Lydia Hopkins
Mary Hopkins
Eleanor P. Hosmer
Olive M. W. Hosmer
Abner Howe
Anna E. Howe
Adelia W. Jacobs
Sophia S. Kaler
Joanna Keene
Louisa Keene
Adelia C. Kirk
Thomas Kirk
Sarah M. Loring
Alfred D. Mansfield
Charlotte Mansfield
Daniel R. Mansfield
Elnathan D. Mansfield
Ermina A. Mansfield
Harriet A. Mansfield
Mary H. Mansfield
Myra Mansfield
Huldah McLoon
Patrick McLoon
Maria Merriam
Ellen M. Norwood
Mary Parker
Elizabeth H. Paul
Elizabeth Pendleton
Louisa Pendleton
Sarah Pendleton
Sarah Pendleton
Lucy T. Piper
Charles R. Porter
Rebecca A. Porter
Stephen Porter
Louisa Ann Rand
Lucy E. Rawson
Mary Richards
John R. Shaw
Sarah M. Shaw
Eliza Simonton
Ann Augusta Stetson
Jane C. Stetson
Lucy W. Stetson
Mary Stetson
Caroline L. Talbot
Nathaniel T. Talbot
Lucy Ann Wilder
Caroline Wood

# The Tables Turned.

# A LETTER

TO THE

## CONGREGATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,

REVIEWING

THE REPORT OF THEIR COMMITTEE

ON

## "The relation of the American Tract Society

TO THE

## SUBJECT OF SLAVERY."

BY A CONGREGATIONALIST DIRECTOR.

BOSTON:
CROCKER & BREWSTER, 47 WASHINGTON-STREET.
NEW YORK:
EDWARD P. RUDD, 18 ANN-STREET.

# A LETTER

TO THE

# CONGREGATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK.

---

Dear Brethren—At your late annual meeting at Spencerport, August 26, 1855, you are represented to have "unanimously adopted" the report of a Committee on the "relation of the leading benevolent societies to the subject of slavery." "The document was received by the association with a deep and painful solemnity; evincing the grief of good men at the course of the Tract Society." "It was voted that it should be published with the minutes, and in the newspapers, and that the delegates of the association to corresponding bodies be requested to acquaint those bodies with its general purport." Thus the ecclesiastical organizations of the several New England states, and of Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Canada, and the general assembly of the (N. S.) Presbyterian church, with which your association hold correspondence, are to enjoy the light shed on a great question by the investigations of your Committee.

The extraordinary importance given to this document will warrant a somewhat detailed examination of its statements and reasonings. There is the more occasion for inquiry as to the *facts* in the case, inasmuch as some of the Congregational journals have been unceasing in their reiteration of the charges of wrong-doing on the part of the American Tract Society. For the first time, these injurious allegations have received a responsible endorsement by the unanimous sanction of a grave ecclesiastical body. The officers of the Society have been occupied with other and better work than newspaper controversy; and the friends of the Society, while grieved with the spirit in which the discussion has been conducted, seem, by common consent, to have maintained a discreet silence. In the humble judgment of a member of your own honored communion, the

time has come to examine the complaints against a peaceful Christian institution, and to disabuse the public mind of those suspicions with which it has been needlessly filled. As unconscious, and it may be hoped unwilling, though responsible, parties to what appears to me to be vital wrong towards an unoffending Society, you are appealed to for the exercise of candor and magnanimity in reviewing a document to which you have lent the influence of your unanimous approval.

I wish to be understood distinctly on one point, at the outset. The right of individual members of benevolent societies, or of Christian pastors, or associations of ministers, to investigate the affairs of religious charitable institutions—nay, the duty of investigating them, so as to have a secure basis for Christian confidence and coöperation, is undeniable. No responsible Society but courts and welcomes such inquiry. But it must be deliberate *investigation*, not inconsiderate reprehension; candid *inquiry*, not fixed pre-judgment, or it is an abuse and a wrong. You intended no such wrong. You proceeded with prudence and caution. A year ago, at your session at Madrid, you passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*—That Rev. Ray Palmer, D. D., Rev. J. P. Thompson, and Rev. S. W. Streeter be constituted a Committee to investigate, and to report at the next meeting of this body, in regard to the course pursued by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the American Home Missionary Society, the American Tract Society, the American Missionary Association, and the American Sunday-school Union, on the subject of slavery." See minutes, page 11.

You expected and had a right to expect your Committee to "*investigate*" a matter of grave concern, and bring before you the results of that investigation. You could not but have supposed that, in a matter involving the character of "the leading benevolent Societies," and their Committees and officers on a vital question—a matter of such moment as to warrant an appeal from your association to all the sister churches in the land with which you hold correspondence, perhaps implicating the character of our entire communion, and involving revolutionary action—the members of your Committee would confer, frequently and prayerfully, about their report. It must have been the conviction that you had thus attained the impartial truth, from impartial and pains-taking men, which induced "a deep feeling of sorrow and of shame, that the cause of Christ was reproached, the Christianity of the North misrepresented, and the Christianity of

the South enfeebled by a policy which eliminates from the gospel, as published by the Tract Society, the heavenly spirit of *equal love to all.*"

The *facts* are these: the chairman of your Committee, whose name alone would entitle it to general credit—*never saw the Report, till weeks after your meeting had been held,* and was absent from the meeting at which it was presented. The report of your meeting leaves the impression that Dr. Palmer *was* present, and a party to this whole matter, no intimation to the contrary being given, either in newspaper or pamphlet, and his name appearing in capitals as "REGISTER AND TREASURER" in the account of your "organization"—see Independent, August 30—though it must be presumed that some *verbal* explanation was made to the twenty or thirty members of your body. And the further fact is stated, without fear of contradiction, that the acting chairman of your Committee, whose multiform duties have required him to pass almost daily the door of the Tract house during the year of his appointment, has in no instance, within that period, made an inquiry of any officer or Committee-man connected with the institution on any point embraced in the Report; while there is indubitable internal proof in the document itself, of a total lack of investigation of the public documents of the Society—with the exception of a pamphlet of sixteen pages, to be noticed hereafter—all which are furnished gratuitously for the asking; and a lamentable ignorance of the extensive series of standard publications, censured without examination. Was this what you expected when you appointed a Committee for *investigation*? Were such your impressions when you adopted unanimously the document they brought before your body? Is this the method of ascertaining the relations of benevolent societies? You will pardon me a somewhat careful investigation and dissection of the document you have given to the world under such solemn sanctions. In attempting this painful task, I propose to follow the order of the Report, with the intention of meeting every important allegation with Christian candor and impartial truth.

The first topic of complaint in your Committee's Report is entitled

## "ALTERATION AND SUPPRESSION."

"The first example of suppression and alteration of sentiments on the subject of slavery," say your Committee, "is in the reprint of

Cotton Mather's *Essays to do Good.* The preface to the Tract Society's edition states that 'in this edition such portions of the original essays are omitted, and such changes have been made in the phraseology as might be expected after the lapse of more than a century since the work was written.' In Cotton Mather's book, as he wrote it, occurs this sentence:

"'O that the souls of our slaves were more regarded by us! that we might give a better demonstration that we despise not our own souls, by doing what we can for the souls of our slaves, [and not using them as if they had no souls! That the poor slaves and blacks which live with us may by our means be made candidates of the heavenly life!] How can we pretend to Christianity when we do no more to Christianize our slaves?'

"The edition of the Tract Society omits the sentences in brackets, and substitutes 'servants' for 'slaves.'

"The following paragraph, which Mather wrote in the same connection, is suppressed in the Tract Society's edition: 'But if any servant of God may be so honored by him as to be made the successful instrument of obtaining from the British Parliament 'an act for the Christianizing of slaves in the plantations,'" etc., as quoted below.

To the foregoing statements, your Committee add the sarcastic comment, "Such are the changes in *phraseology* which might be expected after the lapse of more than a century." The preface as quoted by your Committee, said, "*portions of the original essays* are omitted:" your Committee say, "such are the changes in *phraseology.*"

I have quoted from your report thus fully, that there may be no possible question as to the meaning of your Committee, which certainly must be that the Tract Society are responsible for the alteration or suppression of Mather's *anti-slavery* views, and that thus injury is done to the cause of freedom. The "Unanimous Remonstrance," of a part of Mr. Patton's church, citing this book as proof that "those sentences which have condemned slavery as sinful have been stricken out" by the Tract Society, "for the avowed purpose of avoiding the expression of sentiments which would be distasteful to slave-holders," is followed by your Committee, as above.

I join issue with your Committee, and with the "Unanimous Remonstrance," on every count and phase of this indictment. The book of Mather *was not altered by the Tract Society* on the subject of slavery, but was printed word for word as in Dr. Burder's abridgment of this work; no "Tract Society's edition" of it has been issued for ten years; the original edition *never contained anti-slavery views*, but, on the contrary, must be condemned by your Committee themselves as pro-slavery; and the charge of alteration or suppression recoils upon the head of its authors, as I proceed to show.

So much importance has been attached to this case as to warrant the quotation *entire* of the passages in question, from the reprint of the original edition of 1710. They are as follows: the passages in brackets are omitted in "Burder's edition:" those in *italics* or small capitals are *suppressed* in your Committee's Report.

MATHER ON "THE USAGE OF SLAVES."

"*Masters, yea, and mistresses too, must have their devices how to do good unto their servants; how to make them the servants of Christ, and the children of God. God, whom you must remember to be 'your Master in heaven,' has brought them, and put them into your hands.* WHO CAN TELL WHAT GOOD HE HAS BROUGHT THEM FOR? HOW IF THEY SHOULD BE THE ELECT OF GOD, FETCHED FROM AFRICA, OR THE INDIES, AND BROUGHT INTO YOUR FAMILIES, ON PURPOSE, THAT BY THE MEANS OF THEIR BEING THERE, THEY MAY BE BROUGHT HOME UNTO THE SHEPHERD OF SOULS!

"Oh, that the souls of our slaves were of more account with us! that we gave a better demonstration that we despise not our own souls, by doing what we can for the souls of our slaves, [and not using them as if they had no souls! That the poor slaves and blacks which live with us, may by our means be made the candidates of the heavenly life!] How can we pretend unto Christianity, when we do no more to Christianize our slaves? Verily, you must give an account unto God concerning them. If they be lost through your negligence, what answer can you make unto "God, the Judge of all?" *Methinks, common principles of gratitude should incline you to study the happiness of those, by whose* OBSEQUIOUS *labors your lives are so much accommodated. Certainly, they would be the better servants to you, the more faithful, the more honest, the more industrious, and submissive servants to you, for bringing them into the service of your common Lord.*

["But if any servant of God, may be so honored by him, as to be made the successful instrument of obtaining from a British Parliament, 'an Act for the Christianizing of the slaves in the plantations,' then it may be hoped something more may be done than has yet been done, that the blood of souls may not be found in the skirts of our nation: a controversy of heaven with our colonies may be removed, and prosperity may be restored; or, however, the honorable instrument will have unspeakable peace and joy in the remembrance of his endeavors. In the meantime, the slave-trade is a spectacle that shocks humanity.

"The harmless nations basely they trepan,
And barter baubles for the souls of men;
The wretches, they to Christian climes bring o'er,
To serve worse heathens than they did before."]

Mass. Sab. S. Soc. Edition, pp. 101-4.

Your Committee rely on changes in *this book* as proof of the "alteration or suppression" of "sentiments which would be distasteful to slave-holders!!" There is not a line in the whole pas-

sage *adverse to slave-holding*, not a sentiment "*distasteful to slave-holders*"—though there is just one line and a stanza reprobating the slave-trade—but it is wholly incidental to the main drift of Mather's thought, as is seen by his introducing it with the disjunctive phrase, "In the meantime." On the contrary, do not your Committee, and those who sympathize with them, oppose and denounce the sentiment of Mather's "Original Essays," that slaves are "*the elect of God, fetched from Africa, or the Indies, and brought*,"

"To serve worse heathens than they did before,"

"*on purpose that by the means of their being here, they may be brought home unto the Shepherd of souls?*" That kind of Calvinism savors of the South, more than of New England, just now. And would not your Committee scout the idea of Mather, that gratitude for the "obsequious labors" of slaves should incline to "bringing them into the service of your common Lord"—not to make them free—not even to prepare them for emancipation—but because "they would certainly be the more *faithful*, the more INDUSTRIOUS, and SUBMISSIVE servants to you." Why, this is a sentiment so foreign from the literature of the anti-slavery stamp of our day, that the man who should pen it would be denounced without mercy. Yet these are the sentiments which define and control the meaning of the passage complained of for "suppression;"—and these views are *suppressed by your Committee*, that they may *make* occasion for complaint against a Christian institution! Had your Committee found two such virtually *pro-slavery* passages *in* the Tract Society's books, would they not have furnished a text for numberless diatribes on the subjection of that unfortunate institution to "the slave oligarchy?" And would not your Committee have hailed *one* convincing proof of its delinquency? But your Committee have no thunders for a "leading publishing Society" *of their own denomination* for issuing the edition of Mather *containing* these very pro-slavery passages; while they denounce the Tract Society, on anti-slavery grounds, for *not* publishing these passages—or rather, for not publishing the part of them which, by mutilation, they torture into an anti-slavery sense!

I repeat the remark, as furnishing one of the most astounding illustrations of *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi* the world ever witnessed—that your Committee, in charging the Tract Society with "the alteration and suppression of books penned by pure and holy minds to condemn slavery," have themselves so altered and suppressed the sentiments of their author as to make you believe, and

as to alarm the public with the belief that passages in opposition to slavery were expunged from Mather; whereas no line or sentiment of that character was in the book, but sentiments exactly the converse *were* there.

The fact seems to have escaped the thoughts of your committee that Mather lived and wrote a century and a half ago, in the midst of colonial slavery—for aught that appears in his book, himself a holder of slaves*—and before "the great apostasy." Then it was not fatal heresy to think and write that God may have had great designs of mercy in bringing black heathen into Christian households to be evangelized, or that a care for their souls would make them more "industrious and submissive" "slaves." Jumping at the conclusion that whenever in a book the word "slaves" is found, the writer must be an abolitionist; and noticing that in the "Tract Society's edition" that word did not occur so frequently, they seem to have seized the bait—and have "caught a Tartar."

After your Report had been printed in the Independent, some of "the laymen of New York and Brooklyn" suggested to your committee that they should at least have been as candid as Mr. Patton was; and having borrowed their material from his "Unanimous Remonstrance," they should have given the Tract Society the benefit of two facts stated therein, namely, that Mather's Essays was *abridged by Rev. George Burder* in 1807, which abridged edition was followed in this country; and that the "Tract Society's edition" was dropped

* There are intimations in Mather's Essays that the author *was himself a slaveholder*. In the passages quoted in the text, he speaks of "the poor slaves and blacks which live with us." And then follows "a paper under this title, THE RESOLUTION OF A MASTER," beginning thus:

"1. I would always remember that my servants are in some sort my children," etc., the whole of which is consistent with the idea of his personal relationship as the "master" of slaves. The paper may or may not have been written for Mather's personal use. But the exact reprint of the original edition contains this "note:" "These Resolutions were also doubtless written by Mather." And Burder's edition has a similar note: "The modesty of the author thus expresses, probably, his own production." We leave to the reader the question of Mather's connection with the slave system; simply quoting the appendix to these resolutions as proof that he was a humane and considerate "master," if he was one:

"Age is well-nigh sufficient with some masters to obliterate every letter and action in the history of a meritorious life; and old services are generally buried under the ruins of an old carcass. It is a barbarous inhumanity in men towards their servants, *to make their small failings to be a crime, without allowing their past services to have been a virtue.* Good God, keep thy servant from such ingratitude. Worse than villanous ingratitude!" MATHER'S ESSAYS, page 107.

in 1845. Being partly found out, they put a patch on the pamphlet edition of their Report, intimating that Burder's edition was followed by the Tract Society, and that the book has been dropped from its catalogue; but making a *new issue*, to this effect:

BURDER'S "NOTE."

"Burder stated in a *note*, that he had omitted *passages relating to slavery*, as being inapplicable to England. The original unaltered edition was accessible to the Publishing Committee of the Tract Society, but by following Burder, they adopted his changes, and by *dropping out his note*, they left the reader uninformed of the nature and extent of those changes;" and yet, although the book is dropped, they say, "the changes made in it, when published, show the *settled policy of the Committee on the subject of slavery.*"

In an editorial in the Independent, Oct. 18, nearly two months after your Report was unanimously adopted and printed, another shift is made, thus:

"It is due that an *exact* and *complete* statement of the *facts* should be given to the public. We will therefore state the case precisely as we understand it from *competent* and *reliable* sources. The constituency desire to know these facts for their own guidance, and surely they are entitled to know them, unless the Tract *Society* is a fiction."

The "facts" relate to the Tract Society's responsibility for the "*note*" in Burder's edition, alluded to above, respecting which they say,

"The responsibility of the administration of the Tract Society for these alterations as transferred to their edition, must be determined by three questions which admit of a categorical answer:

"Did they *know* that Dr. Burder had made alterations and omissions *on the subject of slavery?*"

"Did the copy of Burder's edition before them contain his *note*, informing the reader that he had omitted the author's *remarks on slavery?* If so, with what design was that *note* omitted while Burder was followed in his alterations? Was it because *remarks on slavery* were happily inapplicable to this country?" etc.

This, then, is "*an exact and complete statement of the facts*," after two months of supplementary investigation. The sum of all is, that Burder's "*note*, informing the reader that he had omitted the author's *remarks on slavery*," was omitted by the Tract Society. The *main fact*, without which the whole allegation is "a sham," namely, that there is not even the semblance of an anti-slavery sentiment in the book, is still "suppressed."

But that "note," with its announcement of "*remarks on slavery!*"

let us look at it. Are spiritual appeals to men holding slaves to care for their souls that they may be "more submissive slaves," or are paragraphs on the *treatment* of slaves, "*remarks on slavery*" as a system? Does a note referring to "the usage of slaves," mean "*remarks on* SLAVERY?" The *note* to Burder's edition is as follows:

☞ "In the original work, some observations are made in this place with respect to the *usage of slaves*," [that is, the *treatment* of slaves,] "but as the subject has happily no connection with our country, the passage is here omitted."

There is no more allusion to the morality of *slave-holding* or *of slavery* in the note, than there would be to *marriage*, in a note referring to the *education of children*. I will answer your Committee's "three questions," then, by asking a few:

Did they *know* that the original edition of Mather's Essays did not contain a sentiment in opposition to slavery? If they did, are they honest? If they did not, are they not reckless?

Did they know that the note to Burder's edition says nothing about "remarks on *slavery*" or "*passages relating to slavery*" as being omitted, but only alludes to observations on the "usage of slaves?" If they did, have they not imposed anew on the public? If they did not, what do they mean by "an *exact and complete statement of facts*?"

Did they know the fact stated in the preface to the reprint, (in 1845,) of the original edition, that the "first edition of the Essays published in 1710, was never reprinted"—out of print for one hundred and thirty-five years!—and that "it was so rare that a copy of it not long since sold at auction in Boston for about six dollars?" If they did, what ground have they for the unqualified assertion that "the original unaltered edition *was accessible* to the Publishing Committee?" If they did not, why do they write about books they never examined? [The original edition was *not* "accessible," and was not seen.]

Did your Committee ever *see* the "original edition," or the "exact reprint" published by their own denominational concern, or even the "Note" to Burder's edition? If yea, did they examine the two pages from which they pretend to quote, and find the "pro-slavery" sentiments in connection with those respecting the "usage of slaves," which they dare not quote, and cannot endorse? If nay, what reliance can be placed on the statements of any other part of their report?

If Mather contained *pro-slavery* sentiments; and if George Burder omitted them, in the heat of the anti-slavery controversy in England

in 1807, *because* they were "distasteful" to abolitionists; and the Publishing Committee followed Burder's edition; and this act "shows *the settled policy of the Committee on the subject of slavery*," is not the whole report of your Committee and the action based upon it an absurd farce?

So many misrepresentations have clustered around this book, that it may be helpful to recapitulate: Your Committee charged the Tract Society with suppressing Mather's anti-slavery sentiments: I have cited the entire passage to show that the only color for the charge was made by the suppression on the part of your Committee of exactly opposite sentiments. Your Committee held the Tract Society to account for changes made by Burder in 1807, and for a book which they ceased to publish ten years ago, having the means of knowing that such were the facts, but concealing their knowledge until after the adoption and publication of their report. Your Committee then changed their ground, and held the Tract Society responsible for all the changes made by Burder, because "the Society's edition omits Burder's *note*, and does not in any way inform the reader that Mather's *remarks on slavery* have been suppressed." I have shown that there is no such note; but only one speaking of the "*usage of slaves*," which accords with the facts of the book. Your Committee insist that the course of the Tract Society in this case "stands as a way-mark of the policy of the Tract Society on the question of slavery." I have demonstrated that if this be so, and the Tract Society obliterates "pro-slavery" sentiments, your Committee have indicted the wrong party—they should have "arrested the action" of the publishers of Mather's "Original" Essays, if they have any consistency. Does not the whole case present one of the most remarkable instances to be found on record of "tables turned" by simple truth?

### GURNEY.

I have occupied so much space with the review of your Committee's notice of Mather's Essays, that I dismiss their complaints of the change of four lines in *Gurney's* "*Love to God*" with a single remark. Your Committee and all other commentators on Gurney have "suppressed" the announcement on the title-page of the Tract Society's edition, that it is "REVISED UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE AUTHOR." The changes, wise or unwise, are Joseph John Gurney's changes, and he is responsible for them. They have been defended in the "Independent" as harmless or needless. And your Committee have overlooked or "suppressed" the fact that there are *in the same chapter* senti-

ments bearing on the slavery question which leave the author's "testimony" unquestionable, without the repetition of the illustration which is varied in the passage complained of. Your Committee can settle their account with Gurney.

MARY LUNDIE DUNCAN

I now come to the third and last "example," under this head—the memoir of *Mary Lundie Duncan.* Your Committee, in noticing the changes in this work, say, "*In the preface* we are told that a few pages which the Committee deemed of less interest to the general reader, or which alluded to *points of disagreement among evangelical Christians*, have been dropped." The reader is referred to the preface, pp. 3, 4, for proof that NO SUCH PASSAGE EXISTS THERE, *nor is it to be found in any other part of the book!* The only announcement is on the title-page, "ABRIDGED BY THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY."

Your Committee say, "In the original diary we find THIS ENTRY under date of August 1st."

"Freedom has dawned this morning on the British colonies. [No more degraded lower than the brutes, no more bowed down with suffering from which there is no redress.] The sons of Africa have obtained the rights of fellow-subjects—the rights of man, the immortal creation of God. [Now they may seek the sanctuary fearless of the lash; they may call their children their own.] Hope will animate their hearts, and give vigor to their efforts. O for more holy men to show them the way of salvation! The Lord keep them from riot and idleness! They have been so little taught, that He only can avert confusion and tumult as the result of their joy."

Is that the *whole* of "*this entry* under the date of August 1st?" Were your committee afraid that the complete quotation would contradict the tenor of the next count in their indictment—the "Avoidance of the Subject?" Why, when they find space for twenty lines omitted by George Burder about an act of the "British Parliament," did they not find space for the seven other lines of Mary's "entry," which they profess to quote entire, and which are essential to the point at issue? Was it because the fact that there are "some Christians among their number, who will influence others," would prove that they were "*not* degraded *lower* than the brutes?" And must that fact be *suppressed* to suggest some consideration, other than the true one, for the omission of an extravagant representation of an "enthusiastic young lady" of nineteen? The lines suppressed by your committee are these: "*Some Christians there are among their number, who will influence the others. My poor fellow-travellers through*

*life's short wilderness, may I meet with many of you in heaven, where even I can hope to dwell, through the love of my risen Lord. There none will despise the negro, whom Jesus has pitied and redeemed.*" And this in the Tract Society's edition. Had your committee examined the book—as they did *not* even the preface—they might have found the Tract Society's Mary saying, "What can *I* do for my oppressed brethren? Let me bear poor Africa on my heart, and seek a speedy emancipation for her sons, not only from the rod of the oppressor, but from the bonds of iniquity. Long have they dwelt in a night of darkness and sighing, but their cry has entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. O may they now be rescued by his power!"

But your committee do not concern themselves with what is *in* the books, only with what is out of them; for they are about to show "the studious avoidance of the subject," and their plan might be thwarted if they should stumble on the facts.

Will it be claimed, with the above extracts in sight, that there is any suppression of Mary Lundie's rejoicing over the emancipation of slaves in the West Indies, or of her sympathy for those in bondage? Her "testimony" is explicit—so explicit that your committee felt constrained to suppress it in part, lest the very passage complained of should show that, "in the ordinary and natural course of its publications, the Tract Society *does* bear, with its legitimate influence, upon the system of slavery."

The *Independent* itself says of the passage, "It is permitted to appear that the subject of the memoir had an earnest sympathy with the abolition of slavery in the West Indies. Every reader, north and south, sees in a moment, on the perusal of this passage, that Mary Lundie Duncan was what is called an abolitionist. * * If southern public opinion can tolerate the passage as it stands in the abridgment, why may it not tolerate the passage as it stands in the original edition."

The omission of the lines complained of strengthens the testimony, rather than weakens it—for they were not true of the condition of the bondmen of the West Indies, and are not true of the bondmen of the United States—and all exaggeration is weakness. *Is it true* of a class numbering a larger proportion of professed Christians of an evangelical faith than almost any other, that they are "degraded *lower* than the brutes," or that they are restrained from "the sanctuary" by "fear of the lash?" And if even the Independent (see No. for Jan. 25, 1855) can "find no fault with the omission of passages eulogistic of Mr. George Thompson, whose standing in his

own country, among religious people, is not such that any religious Tract Society need hesitate about expunging from the diary of an enthusiastic young lady any passages, in prose or verse, expressive of her admiration of his eloquence"—there need be as little hesitation, certainly, in abridging the rejoicings in the same "diary of an enthusiastic young lady," when mistaken in fact, and exaggerated in expression.

It will thus be seen that the defence of the Society is complete without resorting to the constitutional limitations, which will be subsequently discussed.

Your Committee raise another issue respecting this book which it may be well to notice, as numberless misstatements have been made respecting it, the essence of which may be found in their report. Your Committee state that the author of Mary's Memoir "never gave even a forced consent, (to the abridgment,) till long after the change was made." The Publishing Committee state in their announcement of the book in 1852, as soon as it was issued, that it "was intrusted to the Committee by the esteemed author to be abridged for circulation by the Society, that it might thus be borne to thousands whom it would not be likely to reach in booksellers' channels." The question of veracity which your Committee have seen fit to raise, may safely be left to the candor of the reader, and the respective position of the parties. The same article in the Independent which professed to give "an *exact* and *complete* statement of the facts" concerning Mather's Essays, gives some "facts" respecting Mary Lundie on the point now under discussion. It puts into Mrs. Duncan's mouth eight lines *in marks of quotation*, as "almost the words" "she had written from Scotland;" while the only letter she ever wrote the Tract Society, the one authorizing the Committee to abridge the work at their discretion, *contains no such words, nor any thing implying the same ideas*, nor did she ever express those ideas to any Executive officer of the Society.

What your Committee say about "a forced consent," may be intended to refer to a fact which, when fully known, ought to be final with the professed friends of Mrs. Duncan: that when one of the officers of the Society was in Edinburgh in 1853, and after the Independent and kindred journals had made an ado about the Memoir, in a personal interview with Mrs. Duncan he tendered his influence to have the Memoir dropped from the series of the Tract Society, if she preferred that course to the continued circulation of the abridged

edition: to which she replied, in substance, with characteristic warmth, "God forbid! The book is blessing thousands of habitations North and South, which it would not reach in other forms. No: let it go on, and may God bless it to many precious souls!" I pity the man or woman who cannot respond, Amen! to the sensible Christian sentiment of the mother and biographer of Mary Lundie Duncan.*

"EXAMPLES."

In concluding this part of the review, I feel constrained to direct your attention to the injurious and disingenuous method in which these three publications are brought forward as "*examples* of alteration and suppression." "The fact of suppression has been made conspicuous in two or three prominent EXAMPLES"—"the first EXAMPLE"—"another EXAMPLE"—"still another EXAMPLE"—"and such are the EXAMPLES." What is the obvious import of this language, if it be not that your Committee were cognizant of numerous facts of the same general class, and extending through the catalogue of the Society's publications, of which those cited were fair "examples?" An honest merchant who exhibits a *specimen* of a class of goods, is presumed to have a stock of those goods for the market. A reviewer who singles out *examples* of the style of a voluminous author, is sup-

* Since this paragraph was written, I have had the opportunity of verifying the essential accuracy of the statement from two independent sources. The following is an extract from a letter of the officer of the Tract Society alluded to above, dated "Edinburgh, June 3, 1853."

"I called on Mrs. Duncan last night, with the Rev. Mr. P——. She received me kindly. * * * When speaking of the memoir of her daughter, the topic being introduced by Mr. P——, I said to her, Mrs. Duncan, if it is your wish that your daughter's memoir should cease to be circulated in the Tract Society's channels in its present form, I will use what influence I have with the Committee, to secure its immediate suppression. However desirable it may be for the great purposes for which it was written to continue its circulation, and whatever good to souls may be effected by it, I am confident that the Committee would lay it aside, if it is your deliberate desire.

"'By no means,' was her reply, substantially. '*I should have preferred that my daughter's views of West India emancipation had been retained; but as it is, I hope it will do good, and* I AM SATISFIED.' She has never seen our edition. Would it not be well to inclose several neat copies in Greig and Son's package, ordered herewith."

I am also permitted to make the following extract from the diary of Rev. Mr. P——, made the very evening of this conversation:

"June 2.—In the evening, called with Rev. Mr. ——, who conversed with Mrs. Duncan about the Tract Society and her memoir of Mary Lundie. After a long conversation and explanation, Mr. —— offered to write to the Publishing Committee and use his influence to have the book suppressed, if Mrs. Duncan wished it. 'O no!' she said, 'I AM PERFECTLY SATISFIED WITH IT AS IT IS. The essential features of my daughter's character are preserved, and I hope it will be useful.'"

posed to furnish what is characteristic of the writer, and would be justly considered blameworthy if the "examples" were solitary instances.

Indeed, the odium excited against the Tract Society has been caused chiefly by the impression which your report expressly sanctions, that the expurgations of Mather, Gurney, and Duncan are "*examples*" of a large class, if not of the whole series, of the Tract Society's issues, and that thus "a policy," is pursued, "which eliminates from the gospel, as published by the Tract Society, the heavenly spirit of equal love to all." Had your association been told, in Christian candor, that after diligent search not another example of an omission in reference to slavery has been cited; or had they conceded, as the Michigan report does—"we rejoice to say there are not many such"—would not your action have been modified, and would you not have paused before raising the cry of revolution?

It is a matter of profound surprise that so large a business can have been carried forward so long, on so small a capital. The staple of all the "letters," newspaper articles, resolutions, and reports of ecclesiastical bodies on the subject, for three years, has been found in the three books just reviewed—one of which the Society does not publish and did not alter, and had not an anti-slavery word in it to be expunged; another changed in four lines by the author himself, but still retaining his "testimony" in the same chapter, and the third so distinct in its testimony as to satisfy the Independent. Why, if your committee knew of no other omissions, did they not give the Tract Society the benefit of such a candid statement? That would have been manly and ingenuous, as compared with the five times repeated "example" of wrong-doing.

## "AVOIDANCE OF THE SUBJECT."

Your Committee appear to suppose that they have cleared the way for their new count in the indictment of the Tract Society, namely, the "avoidance of the subject," by suppressing a portion of "the entry in Mary Lundie Duncan's diary," which shows the contrary; by omitting to notice a passage on slavery in the same chapter in Gurney on which they comment; and by converting the pro-slavery sentiments in Mather into anti-slavery sentiments—neither of which sentiments were touched by the Society. They say, "Not less evident, is the studious *avoidance* of this topic, in all the *later* publications of this Society. Some of the *earlier* publications of the Tract

Society contain incidental allusions to slavery as an evil and a sin." And again, "Of *later years* the subject of slavery has either been avoided altogether in the publications of the Society, or has been alluded to with a measured circumlocution that betrays a timid mind, and renders nugatory the passing reference." "This studious avoidance of the subject, where alone the candid discussion of it can be of any moment, is a sad evidence of that fatal spell which the great dragon of the South has cast over many good men in the land."

What is the obvious meaning of this language, if it be not that in "the *later* publications of the Society," there has been a defection from the ground of its earlier publications, which "contain incidental allusions to slavery as an evil and a sin," and which meet your Committee's requisition that it should "NOT be turned into a machinery of anti-slavery propagandism, NOT made distinctly or prominently an anti-slavery Society, but brought to bear, with its legitimate influence, in the ordinary and natural course of its publications upon the system of slavery." So that, if it should appear that its "*later publications*" are consistent with the current issues of former years, in this behalf, the whole allegation falls to the ground.

But before entering on this discussion, allow me to ask the authority for the sweeping charge? Have your Committee found time to collate the hundred thousand pages of the Tract Society's publications, in two thousand different books and tracts, so as to speak of their own *knowledge*? Or, do they take for granted the assertions of The Congregationalist: "On this great theme an utter paralysis has fallen on them. They do not even whisper. They are as silent as the grave." Or of the Congregational Herald: "If the works it publishes contain a hint, sentence, or allusion reflecting on this institution, [slavery,] the Society weeds it out, and exterminates it, *as if* it were a reflection on some divine and sacred institution." Or of the Michigan Report: "It has preserved a *rigid silence*." But a committee of "investigation" could only be safe in any such generalization by *careful investigation*. The presumption is decidedly against their having pursued this course, however, with the positive proof before us, that even the preface of two pages in a specific volume under investigation, and from which a pretended quotation is made, had not been seen by your committee. The truth seems to be that this charge is one of a numerous class caught up from the newspapers; and even if it were true, your committee did not avail themselves of the only method of verifying it.

*Is it true* that there is a special "*avoidance of the subject*" in "the *later* publications" of the Tract Society? It certainly is not true of the books complained of by your committee, which happen to be among the "*later* publications." On this and other points your committee certainly cannot object to the "Independent" as authority—however they might treat the documents of the Society. And the "Independent" cites the very passage in Gurney of which your committee complain, as an "example" of the passages in which "oppression and systems of oppression are condemned, and which, as every reader must feel, are more applicable to slavery, than to any other system of injustice." I have already referred to passages unaltered in the same "*later* publication," with a more unmistakable import. The same journal, as previously quoted, alludes to Mary Lundie, and cites the "entry in her diary, Aug. 1," *in full* from the Tract Society's edition, to show that the Society does *not* "avoid the subject," and adds, "Every reader, north and south, sees in a moment, that Mary Lundie abhorred slavery as violating the "rights of man." Is not this a "*later* publication," and one of the "ordinary publications?" But the Independent of Jan. 25, 1855, occupies a whole column with the great, though simple work of Justin Edwards—till his death a member of the "Publishing Committee"—of which it says, "This [Family Bible, with notes] is a far more efficient book against slavery than any other which has yet received the *imprimatur* of the Committee. It has, as we understand, a rapid sale at the south and south-west; and it is admirably adapted to the use of readers whose literary attainments are of a humble order. How this work touches slavery, may best be shown by a few citations." Passage after passage is then cited in illustration of this remark, and the wish is expressed that a "separate tract" "might be published" therefrom, "for a wide distribution, especially in the northern states." But is not this one of "the later publications?" And if it were otherwise, the objection would be without force as applied to a series of standard publications, all of which are reprinted from year to year, and generally in more editions than one each year—and all of them without date. What foundation then is there for the sweeping charge of your committee?

### THE REAL ISSUE.

Had your committee raised the issue that, instead of "avoiding the subject," the Publishing Committee have not gone out of the "natural and ordinary course of their publications" to discuss it, and recorded their censure because they have "NOT turned the Tract So-

ciety into a machinery of anti-slavery propagandism," and have "NOT made it distinctly or prominently an anti-slavery society," which it is the manifest end and object of the present agitation to accomplish, and on *that* issue made their appeal to your body and to all the churches in the United States and the British provinces associated with you; and to all the members of the Society, for *revolution*—your report would have had the merit of consistency and truthfulness. *That is the real issue:* all else, to quote the elegant language with which you were led to the adoption of the report, is "a sham—a sham." It is needless to go beyond the records of your meeting for proof that the real intention of the agitators in this crusade is to precipitate the Society on the sea of sectional strife, under anti-slavery pilotage, even at the hazard of wreck and ruin. Thus in the remarkable speech which followed the reading of your report, by a "member by courtesy," may be found this pregnant passage, as quoted in the Independent and Congregationalist: "*The inauguration of a new policy would unquestionably* ARREST *the action of the Society.* But *after long and careful thought* on the subject, he was convinced that the present policy debauches the conscience of the north and of the south, and he had come to have the *decided opinion* that if there were *no connection of Christian bodies at the north and south*, Christianity would exert twice the power at the south that it now does. * * The attempt to make a church or denomination "national," impairs the influence of Christianity and the gospel in respect to crime at the south. * * If the Committee of the Tract Society were released from the temptation to suit the *cowardice*—not the *conscience*—of the south, there would at once be freedom of action there." "Let them take care of themselves there, and find out whether they have any religion or not. And I think they have some."

Here is the real issue, boldly made, "after long and careful thought," and as a corollary from and practical application of your report. It is to "*arrest the action of the American Tract Society*," by "the *inauguration of a new policy*." It is to *denationalize* a great Christian institution by *abolitionizing* it. It is to make ten millions of men—who are so bad that we must withhold coöperation, and refrain from benevolent intercourse, and even withdraw gospel agencies from them—*better*, by leaving them to "take care of themselves, and find out whether they have any religion or not."

Here, at last, is the hinging point of this discussion: Shall the American Tract Society, "with its tried and established character for

usefulness, with its catholic evangelical basis, with its rich catalogue of publications, with its efficient system of colportage, with its hallowed memories, with its well-husbanded resources," be revolutionized in its catholic character and national position, or to use the expressive language employed in your meeting,—"*sustaining the views of the Report*"—shall the "action of the Society be *arrested* by the inauguration of a new [abolition] policy?" The language of your Report says, "Not." The *accoucheur* of the Report, "sustaining the views of the Report," says, "Yes." "The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau." One means it; the other says it. The bare knowledge that such is the real issue, will arouse from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the tropics to the Superior, through all the ranks of the churches, and from *Christian anti-slavery men themselves*, an indignant negative.

Against any such revolution, truth and justice revolt, and hold up, as a sufficient shield, the next topic of your Committee—

## "THE CATHOLIC BASIS."

The fundamental rule for the guidance of the Publishing Committee is found in the first article of the Constitution, which is as follows:

"This Society shall be denominated the American Tract Society, the object of which shall be to *diffuse a knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of sinners, and to promote the interests of vital godliness and sound morality, by the circulation of Religious Tracts*, CALCULATED TO RECEIVE THE APPROBATION OF ALL EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS."

Your Committee deem it necessary to establish the point, so elaborately argued in the "Unanimous Remonstrance," that this article of the constitution "refers only to a doctrinal difference of a theological character, and to the sentiments of denominations rather than individuals." The most subtle casuistry, and, I may say, the veriest sophistry, has been employed to fix this interpretation. The facts of history, and the suggestions of common-sense, scatter these reasonings to the wind. Happily some of those who drafted the constitution are still living, and their record of the facts of its adoption is accessible. One of them states that "when the draft of the constitution was first read to the Rev. Dr. James Milnor, he proposed adding the words '*and sound morality*,' as indicating the legitimate fruit of 'vital godliness,' which the Society would by no means undervalue, and they were unanimously agreed to." And farther,

"The first article, as adopted in March, (at a preliminary meeting,) closed with the words, 'calculated to receive the approbation of *evangelical Christians of all denominations.*'" While this article was under consideration, the lamented Rev. John Summerfield suggested that, as the Society was to be a union of *individual Christians*, and not of Christian denominations, he should like, instead of "evangelical Christians of all denominations," to substitute "*all evangelical Christians.*" Dr. Milnor, being in the chair, responded, that he should cordially concur in such a change, as indicating the true character and spirit of the Society; other members of the convention concurred; and the phrase, "ALL EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS" was unanimously adopted.

To secure the carrying out of the principles and spirit of this catholic basis, article 6 provides that "the Publishing Committee shall contain no two members from the same ecclesiastical connection; and no tract shall be published to which any member of that committee shall object."

The careful reader will perceive that this basis is widely different from that of a church organization, and that by its own limitations this association for a specific purpose assumes no such general responsibilities as rest on the church and ministry. It is a voluntary association of individual Christians, to do a certain good by certain means—leaving its own members in other relations, and all other associations in their several relations, to promote, without hinderance, such enterprises as they please. Matters of agreement, whatever they may be, are alone befitting on such a platform. And the judgment of the Publishing Committee both as to the fact of agreement, and the expediency of action, must be unanimous and final—or there can be no security for harmony.

### ARE POLITICAL AND AGITATING QUESTIONS EXCLUDED?

With what semblance of truth is the claim set up that matters of "*doctrinal difference of a theological character*" and "the sentiments of *denominations*" alone are excluded from this catholic platform; and that consequently it may be made the bear-garden for contending factions on questions of morality and reform! "How can two walk together except they be agreed," on other than abstract questions of theological science? Are not social and moral questions the divisive topics of our times, and of some past years—overriding all great political questions, and even hushing the din of sectarian controversy with their discordant cries? And were the planks of the Tract So-

ciety's platform so loosely laid as to make it the legitimate battle-ground for these thousand and one isms?

Your Committee seem to think so; and in their attempt to convict the Tract Society of inconsistency in the practical application of the gospel to some social and moral evils and not to others, they betray an utter want of knowledge both of what the Society has done and what it has not done. Thus, without multiplying examples, they say, "However evangelical Christians are agreed in their estimate of the sin of drunkenness and the evils of intemperance, there is among them a notorious diversity of opinion as to the remedy of these evils, and as to the principles and measures upon which the temperance reform should be conducted. Yet this does not deter the Society from publishing tracts upon *one side* of this now political and agitating question."

Craving pardon for the flat contradiction, "it *does* deter the Society from publishing tracts upon *one side* of this now political and agitating question." So long as temperance was a purely moral, and in a high sense a religious question, involving directly the well-being for time and eternity of tens of thousands of souls, it was a befitting topic of discussion in "religious tracts," and these tracts were "calculated to receive the approbation of all evangelical Christians," and have received it, so far as known, with entire unanimity. But when the "wine-question" was in dispute, and when the "Maine Law" agitation threw the subject into the whirlpool of politics, and other "political and agitating" aspects of the Reform appeared, the Tract Society was necessarily "deterred from publishing tracts upon *one side*" of those political and agitating contests—yet without any insinuation being thrown out from any quarter, we believe, that this implied hostility to temperance men, or sympathy with the liquor traffic. By common consent, the Tract Society's catholic basis seems to have been understood as restraining it from political and partisan alliances—just as, in the somewhat parallel case, it has restrained it from sectional entanglements, and from all *ists* and *isms* involving angry controversy and divisions among evangelical Christians. So general has this conviction been, that so far as known, not a dollar was ever contributed to the Society, with a view to "anti-slavery propagandism," and no tract or book on slavery was ever written for, or laid before the Publishing Committee!

That the subject of slavery has become a "political and agitating question," will not be denied. It is complicated, more or less,

with all the commercial, political, social, and religious interests and institutions of the land. It awakens more of imbittered and exasperated feeling in its discussion than any or all other political or moral questions. It sunders churches, overwhelms parties, absorbs the political and religious press, and convulses a continent. That the system involves evils of vast magnitude, is claimed by good men at the North, and conceded by good men at the South; and that is nearly the limit of approximation in sentiment among evangelical Christians. As to the nature and extent of these evils, and especially the remedy for them, few men either at the North or South, are agreed. It cannot be asserted with any positiveness, that the limit of agreement among evangelical Christians extends beyond the sentiments contained in the Tract Society's series. Or, if it does, it would not be easy to show that sound wisdom, or the claims of Christian duty, or the best good of the slave, would demand the "inauguration of a new policy" which would "*arrest* the action of the Tract Society" in its beneficent work, at a time and in circumstances which imperiously call for centripetal more than for centrifugal agencies, and for vigorous evangelization, more than for new elements of disintegration and discord. It may be argued that there ought to be such unanimity of sentiment as would warrant the "inauguration of a new policy." If so, *is* there such unity? Where is it exhibited? What proof that it exists? What overwhelming proof, in the endless divisions and agitations of our day, that the "inauguration of this new policy" would be at the expense of the peace, prosperity—nay, the very existence of the Tract Society; or, if it lingered, would it not be with a broken constitution, a violated faith, and a perjured conscience?

## "THE COMMITTEE'S DEFENSE."

Probably no portion of the Report of your Committee made a more profound sensation in your body than that occupying two-thirds of a column as printed in the Independent, entitled, "The Committee's Defense." There is certainly none that exhibits more ingenuity. It is but justice to say, that this part of the report is original, and is not taken from Jay or Patton. Your Committee say,

"Most humiliating, too, is the defence of its policy which the officers of the Tract Society have *lately issued*. Several churches, associations, religious journals, and private individuals, members of the Society and contributors to its funds, having remonstrated with the Executive Committee upon their policy on the subject of slavery, *the*

*Committee have at length issued a* document by way of vindication, entitled, 'Principles and Facts of the American Tract Society.' This reply is a beautiful specimen of typography, embellished with a very pretty picture of the Tract House. But the document itself is a most remarkable illustration of the timid policy of the Committee upon the subject of slavery. *It ignores the very question at issue.* Only by the most remote allusion does it recognize any dissatisfaction with the course of the Committee on slavery—a system which it does not so much as name in a tract of sixteen pages. That allusion is in the following terms: 'This Society was formed by Christians of various denominations, to publish the great evangelical truths in which they are agreed. It is thus precluded from publications involving subjects of controversy among evangelical Christians. Nor can topics of a local or sectional character be expected in the issues of a national catholic institution."

"The remainder of this document treats entirely of the material interests of the Tract Society, of its mechanical arrangements, its evangelical character, and its general work; repeating the commonplaces of every annual report, of every sermon by secretary or agent, and of almost every number of the American Messenger."

We have proof, at last, that during the year of your Committee's investigations, one of the two thousand publications of the Tract Society has been found in their hands; and without stopping to notice the "alteration and suppression" by which the passage they pretend to quote is garbled and mutilated—excluding the formal statement of the constitutional basis of the Society, and annulling the testimony as to the harmonious working of the union principle; and without questioning the omniscience of your committee, who claim to know the contents of "*every* sermon by secretary or agent"—I proceed to examine the mode of treatment accorded to this alleged "defence of the Committee."

### HOW THE "DEFENSE" IS TREATED.

If it were a "Defense," one would think that an official document from a source at least respectable, would be entitled to respectful dealing in an official report to a ministerial body—especially if it might be regarded as the only "answer" to a persistent assault of three years from "several churches, associations, religious journals, and private individuals." The seven lines quoted from the document as furnishing the whole of the "Committee's Defence" would of course be discussed with candor, and the simple principles they announce might have been controverted by fair argumentation. Instead of this, your Committee, with solemn Christian and ministerial vows upon them, in the presence of a body of ministers of the gospel of truth

and peace, having set up a man of straw, catechize him after this fashion:

"Good men, men of standing in the church and in society, whole churches and associations, the religious press, all ask of the Society, 'Why do you not, in some of your many thousand publications, condemn that systematic wrong which defrauds the laborer of his hire?'

"*The Committee answer*—'The Tract House at 150 Nassau-street, is eighty feet by ninety-four, and five stories high, besides basement for storing paper, and cellar for coal, p. 1.'

"The inquirers ask, Why do you not in some of your varied publications, enforce the duty of teaching all men to read, of giving all men the Bible; and condemn the crime of keeping any from the light of God's word?'

"*The Committee answer*—'The Society employs 619 colporteurs, and publishes more than 200,000 copies of the Family Christian Almanac, p. 9.'"

And the same witty dialogue is carried on through half a column of your Report, as published in the Independent. Instead of occupying the space with quoting it in full, suppose this kind of logic should be applied in other quarters, thus:

Numberless readers of religious newspapers having "the largest circulation in the world," finding little else than sectional and sectarian controversy in their columns, turn their famishing souls to the neglected Bible, and ask, "What must I do to be saved?"

The Bible "answers"—"Dan, and Naphtali, Gad, and Asher," Exodus, chap. 1 : 4. "At Parbar westward, four at the causeway, and two at Parbar." 1 Chronicles, chap. 26 : 18.

The inquirers ask, Why does not the "religious press" have some *religion* in it, and where can we find a newspaper that does not "crucify the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

The *Independent* "answers"—"The New York Picayune is the most original comic paper now published in America. Each number contains from four to six illustrations, being hits at the times, *Quizzible and Risible.* It contains the quaint and satirical lectures of Mr. Julius Cæsar Hannibal, the greatest darkey lecturer of the day." *Independent*, p. 21, A. D., 1855.

The ingenuity of a school-boy might overwhelm any antagonist with the number and variety of these ludicrous citations; and infidelity has not been sparing of this low and vulgar logic. But is it worthy of Christian men and Christian bodies in the pursuit of truth? Your Committee seem to have had a twinge of something like conscience, for they add the comment, "*We have not caricatured* the doc-

ument issued from the Tract House as a virtual reply to the inquiries and remonstrances of thousands of friends of the Society, as to its policy on the subject of slavery."

### WHAT THE "DEFENSE" REALLY IS.

But it is time to show what this "Defense of the Committee" is, which has been made the butt of ridicule, and the scorn of your Committee. The Tract Society, like every other institution, has been accustomed from its foundation, to have for convenient circulation, a brief document setting forth the principles of its organization and the facts of its work. Six or eight years ago the substance of the pamphlet of sixteen pages was issued in twelve pages, without a cover, "embellished with a very pretty picture of the Tract House," and tens of thousands were circulated by colporteurs and agents. After various revisions, the document being out of date, was revised in 1854, and a cover put on it, and what had no name other than "the American Tract Society," under the "pretty picture," was entitled "Principles and Facts of the American Tract Society." It was printed in 1854 in 200,000 numbers of the American Messenger, and sent by mail to every minister of the gospel in the land whose address was known, as a means of information, and an agency for enlisting benevolent aid. If it was a "Defense of the Committee," they did not know it, until told by your Committee. The fact that "it ignores the very question at issue" weakens somewhat the testimony of your Committee on this point; and perhaps would have justified your Committee in their daily walk past the Tract House in inquiring within, how long it had been published? and what its object was? before *assuming* that it was "lately issued," and that "at length the Executive Committee have issued a document by way of vindication:" or, if this involved too much *investigation*, they might surely have referred to the files of the "Independent," where, nearly a year ago, in discussing the very matter now in hand, the editors make a respectful allusion to "*a little pamphlet recently published*, (*Principles and Facts of the American Tract Society*,") from which they quote a paragraph, without mutilation, to show "what it (the Society) has done in relation to slavery." But the editors, though calling loudly and often for a "vindication" or a "reply" or an "answer," had not *then* made the sapient discovery that a pamphlet which "ignores the whole subject," and which was *then* "recently published," was "the Committee's Defence" "lately issued" in the September following!

Your Committee wax indignant, and are "lofty like Luther," in

their denunciation of "such an *answer* as is given in this pamphlet to the respectful inquiries of thousands of the supporters of the Society," which, they say, "however well meant, is little less than an *insult* to the understanding of the Christian public." I cannot descend to the exchange of opprobrious epithets with your Committee; but I submit whether it is not something *more* than "an insult to the understanding of the Christian public," for a committee of *investigation* to misrepresent the object, and caricature the contents, and bring contempt upon the authors of a benevolent appeal of a Christian institution, when their own organ, in its own editorials, furnished the materials of disproving every allegation and witticism they have manufactured out of the only document or publication of the Tract Society they seem to have examined.

Your Committee's attempt to mend the matter when they discovered, after its "unanimous adoption," but before the publication of the report, that they had made an egregious blunder, to say the least—by announcing in the Independent that "since the report was in type, we have heard it alleged that the pamphlet entitled 'Principles and Facts of the American Tract Society,' is a stated issue, revised from year to year,"—only adds to their confusion. For they say, "But it will be found on examination to contain the substance of what has appeared in the Messenger and elsewhere on the part of the Publishing Committee, with obvious reference to the state of public feeling towards the Society." But did not their report reproach that very committee for not having "the magnanimity to give a reason for their silence?" Did they not speak of the appearance of "*a* document *at length* issued by way of vindication;" implying that nothing had appeared "in the Messenger and elsewhere," of that nature?

## "EFFECTS OF THIS POLICY."

Your Committee are entitled to the honor of inaugurating a new philosophy, if not "a new policy." Cause for effect, effect without cause, and cause without effect, are interchanged and transposed with surprising facility. They say, "This policy of omission, suppression, and evasive silence on the subject of slavery, which may be fairly said to characterize the present administration of the Tract Society, tends to degrade the moral sense of Christians at the south, with reference to that system of iniquity, which they should labor continually to abolish." And your Committee revert again to Gurney and Lundie Duncan as their *only* illustrations. I have shown conclu-

sively that both are unmistakable in their incidental testimony against slavery and the slave-trade. I have shown that Mather's Essays, in the form in which your Committee demand their publication might "degrade the moral sense of Christians at the South," while Burder's edition, now complained of, could not have any such tendency. I have shown that there has been no "evasive silence." Your Committee then, are without premises for their conclusions, without causes for alleged effects, without facts as even the basis for their fictions. Nay, more, they charge upon the Tract Society the consequences of their own and their associates' relentless war upon the South, and seek to shift the responsibility of a natural and inevitable reaction in southern feeling caused by the fanatical zeal of some northern men, and northern papers, upon a Christian institution steadily pursuing its appropriate work! Your Committee have the assurance to arraign the Tract Society for "helping to create that vicious and arrogant public sentiment *for* slavery, before which this great Society now bows in humiliating silence!" How? When? Where? The only proof of this fiction is itself a fiction: and so is the assertion that Carter's edition of Mary Lundie is "challenged at the South," *because* of the Tract Society's abridgment; whereas the interruption to its circulation, if any, is more certainly caused by the exaggerated and false impressions made by such statements as are contained in their report.

Your Committee were charged with the duty of investigating the relations of the American Tract Society, and other institutions, to slavery. They have reached the vital point of the question, and are discussing the "effects" of the policy "which may be fairly said to characterize the present administration of the Tract Society;" and here, if anywhere, you would naturally expect a candid allusion to those general reformatory relations of evangelizing, converting agencies, which Christians and Christian ministers have been wont to claim as one of the glories of the gospel. I confess my astonishment at the total silence of your Committee on this point. If I did not feel confident that it was the result of that intense one-idea-ism which ardent minds are liable to, especially when conscientiously wrong, I should fear lest political and philanthropic alliances had seduced your Committee from their evangelical affinities, and that we must mourn over new wrecks of character and of faith on the strands of scepticism. And my amazement is the more profound, that your Committee could not discover in all their investigations, one relieving fact, one redeeming element, one hopeful influence of the Tract Society's wide-

spread labors at the South; inasmuch as I recal a series of *editorial* articles in the *Independent*, so full, and explicit, and candid in their exhibitions of the real and obvious effects of these labors, as to have neutralized the influence of their subsequent complaints. And I could not help thinking that an elaborate report to an ecclesiastical body ought to be as candid and truthful as newspaper editorials. But perhaps the "responsibility" of editors does not extend even to the *reading* of their own columns.

### THE INDEPENDENT CITED AGAINST THE REPORT.

At the hazard of prolixity, allow me to cite some proofs of the "omission, suppression, and evasive silence" of your Committee as to "the effects of the policy which may fairly be said to characterize the present administration of the Tract Society," drawn from the only quarter which your Committee may regard as authoritative—the editorial columns of the *Independent*. And lest it should be thought that the quotations are made from inconsiderate and rash articles, it is due to your Committee to cite the announcement which immediately precedes the quotations, as follows: "It is no caprice which moves us to take up the discussion of this subject. We take up the business deliberately, with a full sense of the importance of what we are doing, and not unmindful of the consequences," etc. O that *your Committee* had "taken up the business" with the same deliberation, and with the same regard for consequences! It would, at least, have rendered this long review needless.

"We honor the American Tract Society," say the editors of the Independent, Jan. 11, 1855. "We thankfully acknowledge its great usefulness, and especially its usefulness in the southern and southwestern states. We believe it is doing, indirectly, more than any other institution—more than could be done directly, by twenty anti-slavery societies—in the great work of teaching the slaves to read, and of raising them, with their masters, to the stage of civilization in which their emancipation will be an irresistible necessity." Could not your Report have quoted such a paragraph from the Independent, as easily as it copied bitter things from Jay's letter? But it might have weakened the force of the cry for revolution!

The very next number of the Independent employs three columns in showing the "effects of this policy," and a few quotations will be apposite. Thus, when combating the sentiment of the superiority of the slave-holding states, as compared with the free, in the abundance of religious privileges, the Independent says, "The most pe-

remptory refutation of the statements and arguments now referred to, may be gathered from its (the Tract Society's) reports and other publications, in which it presents to patriotic and Christian minds its plans and its labors. For example, in a little pamphlet recently published, (Principles and Facts,) they say, 'The southern and southwestern states present a wide and important field,' etc. [Here is the "Tract of 16 pages," which in January, is characterized as "presenting to patriotic and Christian minds the Tract Society's plans, and its labors;" and in August, is caricatured as "the Committee's Defense"—"recently published," in January, and "lately issued," in August!] And the Independent adds to its extended quotation from the documents of the Society, the comment, "Every year—perhaps we might say every month—the Society is laying before thoughtful and conscientious people throughout the whole extent of our common country, just such statements as these, concerning the ignorance, the irreligion, the poverty, the very barbarism of counties and districts, and masses of population at the South." (And the editor might have added, *at the North and West, too.*) "*All this has a momentous bearing on the ever-agitated subject of slavery*"—though your Committee of investigation did not perceive it. "So far as these statements are read by thinking people in the southern states," the Independent proceeds, "society there is growing conscious of its own wants; and in proportion as southern society becomes conscious of its own wants, it must needs become silently conscious of the great evil by which it is thus darkened and depressed. On the other hand, the effect of these continually iterated statements on religious people at the North, is an ever-spreading and deepening abhorrence of slavery as an institution in society. Clergymen especially, of various denominations, read these statements, and retain the impression of them. They receive these statements not with the necessary suspicion with which they hear an anti-slavery lecture, or read the publications of anti-slavery societies, but with undoubting confidence in the competence and credibility of the witnesses. Perhaps it would not be too much to say that, to the masses of testimony continually given by the Tract Society in this undesigned and incidental way, not less than to any other influence, the clergy of the North are indebted for that unanimity of abhorrence with which they look upon every project for the extension of slavery into new territories," etc.

Why, if your Committee had not the magnanimity to acknowledge their indebtedness to the Tract Society, as the Independent does, for

awakening "the ever spreading and deepening abhorrence of slavery" at the North, had they not the candor to recognize this "momentous bearing on the ever-agitated subject of slavery" at the South, as presented in the columns of their own organ?

But this is not all. The Independent says, "The operations of the American Tract Society in the slave-holding states are constantly and powerfully counteracting the natural effects of slavery there, and aiding the action of all the influences that will ultimately accomplish the abolition of slavery. We are far from imputing such an intention to the managers or servants of the Society."

Well, we are not discussing "intentions," but "effects." *Your Committee assert* that the effect of the "policy which fairly characterizes the present administration of the Tract Society is to debase the moral sense of southern Christians, to help create a vicious and arrogant public sentiment *for* slavery," and of course to retard its removal; and not a line in the report intimates that there are any qualifications or drawbacks to these "effects:" while *the Independent asserts* that the same policy "constantly and powerfully counteracts the natural effects of slavery, and aids the action of all the influences that will ultimately accomplish the abolition of slavery." The report asserts a debasing influence on the *South:* the Independent claims an enlightening influence not only on the South, but also on the *North.*

### MORE FROM THE INDEPENDENT.

The Independent further concedes that "the Tract Society is doing a great work among the enslaved population," and says, "No intelligent person, acquainted with the fascinating books for children which the colporteurs are vending and giving away so abundantly, can doubt that where such books are in the hands of children and illiterate white persons living in the midst of slaves, and in habits of constant and friendly intercourse with them, every slave of ordinary capacity, in whom the grace of God has awakened a desire to read the word of God, or whose mind under whatever impulse, aspires toward intellectual development, can easily learn the alphabet. No man can doubt that where white children and adults, equally unlettered with the slaves around them, are rejoicing in that excitement which attends the acquisition of the power to read, and in that conscious growth of the mind which comes of reading what the mind can feed upon—the slaves are also learning to read, and rising with sure and steady motion in the scale of intellectual and moral develop-

ment. The Tract Society is a great educator in these regions; 'the schoolmaster is abroad' there in the person of the colporteur. How the colporteur teaches people to read may be seen in the following specimen." (Here follows a fact from a colporteur's report.) And the Independent continues: "Could not a slave learn to read in the same way? Are not thousands of them learning to read where those beautiful little books from Nassau-street are scattered like 'leaves in Vallambrosa?'" etc.

Is it to be understood by the "evasive silence" of your Committee as to all these matters which appear to the editors of the Independent to have some relations to the subject assigned to them, that your Committee dissent from the Independent, or that it is of no account as to their ulterior objects that a grand and peaceful system of popular education for black and white is "abroad," with its elevating power? And even if there were such discordances between your Committee and the editors, might not your Committee have intimated to your body that some weak persons at the North did entertain some such views, and thus have given the Tract Society the benefit of a doubt whether they were doing unmixed evil?

But I have not done with the Independent's opposition to the views of your report. The editors continue: "The Tract Society is doing a great work for those portions of the white population in the southern states who have been most depressed and degraded by the institution of slavery. These poor whites are found everywhere; they are the materials of which mobs are made. But by a natural pressure they are partially crowded out of the rich plantation counties into the "back counties," where slave-labor cannot be profitably employed. In these districts it is that the Tract Society finds its most inviting and hopeful field of action. Thus the American Tract Society is the true southern-aid society. Unembarrassed by any sectarian, [sectional,] or ecclesiastical relations, it brings new light and a new life and power to the aid of whatever church arrangements it finds in existence. Its books fall into the hands of ministers who have just learning enough to read them; and these ministers find themselves brought into contact with Edwards, Doddridge, Baxter, Owen, and a host of gifted minds raised up in successive ages for the guidance and advancement of the church. The same books, and others far more elementary, find currency among the people, get established in many a household, and waken the old and the young to new ideas. The consequence is . . . , *revivals of religion take place. Sunday-schools are*

*established. Secular-schools follow. Newspapers begin to circulate;—the American Messenger first—others of a more miscellaneous character afterwards. Thus a great change, religious, moral, intellectual, and ultimately political, is slowly taking place in these communities.*" But your Committee ignore it all!

Would that I had space for the "illustrations" of this subject from the documents of the Society, of which the editors of the Independent quote a full column. But I must content myself with their comments on them, which follow:

"Now we hold, and we are confident that every intelligent person must admit, that where such work is going forward in the impoverished and benighted districts of the South, the day is approaching when the political domination of the slave-holding interest must be greatly weakened. These poor people as they grow in knowledge, and as their communities are more and more pervaded with the spirit of religious awakening and progress, as they take the business of their own improvement and advancement more and more into their own hands, feeling more and more that it is the greatest of their interests, will grow more truly democratic—will gradually throw off the yoke of a slave-holding oligarchy, and will be felt as a force in the legislation and government of their own states and the Union. As they come into a sort of communion and intercourse with evangelical Christendom at large by familiarity with those books of religious experience which are classical with all the churches of the free states and of Great Britain, [how can they when the "inauguration of a *new policy* arrests the action of the Tract Society?"] and know that those books, however expurgated for their use, were written by men whose feelings and opinions were wholly adverse to slavery, they will outgrow that fanatical horror of 'abolition' by means of which their demagogues in church and state are now ruling them. The American Tract Society, without any distinct aim or purpose in that direction, is contributing powerfully to the ultimate abolition of slavery."

Such are the convincing proofs of the "omission, suppression, and evasive silence" of your Committee, gathered from the columns of the Independent as to the "effects of this policy." May I not ask if the views thus presented are not quite as important as a rehash of their own and others' mistaken accounts of changes in Gurney and Duncan, which form the *only* basis of their sweeping and unfounded charge, that the Tract Society has "debased the moral sense of

southern Christians" and "helped to create that vicious and arrogant public sentiment *for* slavery, before which this great Society of evangelical Christians bows in humiliating silence?"

I leave the editors of the Independent to settle their differences among themselves, and their differences with your Committee. The only sensible solution seems to be, that in January, the Independent was seeking for *truth:* in August, your Committee were seeking a *revolution.*

## "THE REMEDY."—REVOLUTION.

Your Committee, borrowing the suggestion from the usages of *political* demagogues, recommend that "the members of the Society, severally or in companies, address to each member of the Publishing Committee, and to the Secretaries, the simple inquiry: Are you in favor of bringing the influence of the American Tract Society, through its ordinary publications to bear against the system of American slavery?" etc. "If this question shall be answered in the affirmative, the course of the Society in future will be plain. If in the negative, on the part of any or all the members of the Committee, or of the Secretaries, let there be at the annual election of the Board of Directors a *vote* equivalent to a vote in the British Parliament of 'want of confidence in the existing ministry.'" How naturally *political* precedents suggest themselves to your Committee, while laying their revolutionary plans! That this language means REVOLUTION, and nothing else, is clear from the remark intended to smother the scruples of some men who may be supposed to retain a respect for life-long fidelity to the cause of God—"There is no reason why an officer of any benevolent Society, however valuable his services, or however estimable his character, should have a life-lease of his office, or should be continued in that office for form's sake, when he is unwilling to conform the policy of the institution to the known wishes of the great body of his constituents."

Your Committee would have all the members of the Society, "severally or in companies address *each* member of the Publishing Committee and the Secretaries;" and every inquiry must of course have a reply, or there will be a new score of complaints opened for discourtesy and "evasive silence." There are about twelve thousand members. Should only half the whole constituency follow the advice of your Committee, and write individually, it would make fifty-four thousand letters to be written, and of course the same number of

replies to be sent. If we suppose each person addressed to write fifty letters a day—which is a pretty good day's work—it would require one hundred and twenty days each for nine men, to perform the task imposed by your Committee—rather a heavy burden, one would think, to add to the thirty years of gratuitous and unrequited toil of the Publishing Committee—to say nothing of the labors of the Secretaries. Meanwhile, what is to become of the proper work of the Committee and Secretaries? Of that your Committee seem not to have thought.

"THE GENERAL CHRISTIAN SENTIMENT."

But there is an *assumption* running through this and other parts of your Committee's report, which underlies and taints the whole document, namely, that "the known wishes of the great body of constituents," that "the Christian sentiment of the supporters of the Tract Society," that "the general Christian sentiment of their constituents," are in conflict with the "policy which may *fairly* be said to characterize the present administration of the Tract Society on the subject of slavery," and are in harmony with the spirit and aims of your Committee's Report. Some men think they are turning the world upside down when they are only *turning upside down in the world.* What shadow of proof have your Committee of the correctness of their generalization? What data for their wholesale assumption?

During the past three or four years a relentless war has been waged on the Tract Society by a few public journals, and the utmost efforts have been made to sap the foundations of public confidence in its character. A mode of assault has been adopted wholly unwarrantable. Is it too much to say of this crusade, that "judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter; yea, truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey: and the Lord saw it, and it displeased him, that there was no judgment." With the patience of martyrdom, the Tract Society has borne and forborne to the last; like the Master it owns and honors, when it "was reviled, it reviled not again; when it suffered, it threatened not; but committed itself to him that judgeth righteously." It has pursued its course of quiet unobtrusive usefulness with the vain hope that a *one-sided* and groundless controversy would sometime have an end; and with the belief that "if when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God"—more acceptable than to

# PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

# AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY,

IN

BOSTON, APRIL 25, 1855.

BOSTON:

PRINTED BY JOHN WILSON AND SON,

22, School Street.

1855.

# PROCEEDINGS.

SEMI-ANNUAL MEETING, APRIL 25, 1855,

AT THE

ROOMS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN BOSTON.

Hon. Stephen Salisbury, President, took the chair.

The Secretary read the Report of the last stated meeting.

Hon. Ira M. Barton read the Semi-annual Report of the Council.

The Librarian read his Semi-annual Report.

The President read the Semi-annual Report of the Treasurer.

On motion of Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, "*Voted*, That the Report of the Council, of which the Librarian's and Treasurer's Reports form a part, be referred to the Committee on Publication, with instructions to print such portions as they think proper."

The Society proceeded to ballot for members; and the following gentlemen, who had been nominated by the Council, were elected: —

| | |
|---|---|
| Edward Tuckerman, Esq. . . . . | Amherst. |
| Rev. Dr. Henry Jackson . . . . . | Newport, R. I. |
| Capt. Robert J. Q. McClure . . . . | British Navy. |
| Dr. Elisha Kent Kane . . . . . | American Navy. |
| Hon. Alexander H. Bullock . . . . . | Worcester. |
| J. Hammond Trumbull, Esq. . . . . | Hartford, Conn. |
| J. Wingate Thornton, Esq. . . . . | Boston. |

On motion of Hon. Emory Washburn, the thanks of the Society were voted to the American Academy for the use of their rooms for this meeting.

On motion of the Secretary, "*Voted*, That the day of the Annual Meeting be the 21st of October, unless that day fall on Sunday, when the meeting shall be held on the 22d of October."

Adjourned.

Attest, EDWARD E. HALE,

*Recording Secretary.*

# REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

The Council of the American Antiquarian Society respectfully submit their Semi-annual Report.

The munificent founder of this Society, in one of his earliest communications, made to it in 1813, congratulated the members upon the safe location of their Library and Museum "forty miles distant from the nearest branch of the sea, in the town of Worcester, Mass., on the great road from all the Southern and Western States to Boston, the capital of New England." This location of our institution in the country, upon so extensive a thoroughfare was, no doubt, a wise arrangement. May it not be regarded less so, since the quiet town of Worcester has become a city of twenty-five thousand souls, and since its "great road" has given place to a star of railways, radiating in every direction from its centre.

But though the provisions of our charter require "that the Library and Museum of the Society shall be kept in the town of Worcester," yet this "capital of New England" has, from the beginning, been one

of the chosen seats of its operations. Its corporate existence commenced there. It was organized under its act of incorporation, at the Exchange Coffee House in Boston, November 19, 1812. Since that period, the annual and semi-annual meetings of the Society have alternated between Boston and Worcester; and it is an agreeable duty, on the part of the members of the Council resident at Worcester, thus statedly to report to the Society in Boston, the situation and progress of an Institution which, we trust, will long enjoy our common care and regards. Yet, in the history of an Institution like ours, whose existence should be measured on the calendar of ages, not much that is new can be expected, either in acts or results, in the space of a half-year. To render progress palpable, we must take stand-points more remote from each other. Count, for example, from the first eight years of the existence of this Society, when its meetings, its library, and its cabinet, all had accommodations in the private rooms of the mansion of its hospitable founder on Court Hill, in Worcester, to the present period, that finds us with an ample Hall, on the same beautiful eminence, containing a library of more than twenty thousand volumes, with a capacity to receive other twenty thousand; and the progress of this Institution becomes not only palpable, but extraordinary.

The completion and occupancy of our new Hall, and the advantageous disposition of the old one, have heretofore been announced to the Society; and it is an

agreeable appendix to that report to be able to say, that the new Hall is not only completed and occupied, but has been paid for; that the Society is free from debt; and that the original funds of twelve thousand and of five thousand dollars, established by the will of Dr. Thomas, have been preserved unimpaired, with such an accumulation of interest as makes them now amount, in the aggregate, to $28,696.84.

A detailed description of our new Hall has been given in former communications to the Society. It is here only necessary to add, that the entire cost of it has been about $18,000. The semi-annual account of the Treasurer accompanies this Report, from which it appears that the above balance of $28,696.84 is remaining in his hands, and that the same is invested in a safe and productive manner.

The Librarian will report the accessions made to the Library within the last six months. The Congress of the United States, the Legislature of this Commonwealth, and the authorities of several other States in the Union, have made legal and liberal provision for supplying our Library with copies of their respective statutes and official documents. To enjoy this distinguished consideration throughout the country is certainly gratifying; but it would be much more so were it not too evident that the pressure of the public business of the States, deprives them as well as ourselves of the advantage which a regular contribution of such documents could not fail to afford. The legislative

acts and proceedings of a free State embody the most authentic materials for its current history, and become invaluable to the future historian and antiquary. Impressed with these views, the Council have made efforts, with some success, to insure larger and more regular contributions of the character here referred to; and they would respectfully suggest, that if members of this Society, in visiting the capital of any of the States, were personally to present the subject of such contributions to the notice of the proper officers of the government, they would always be kindly received and liberally answered.

But it is not only the facts embraced in public documents that the antiquary is to preserve. The acts and doings of all minor institutions, whether civil, religious, literary, or political, and even the ever-varying popular movements that ruffle the surface of social affairs, are all to be carefully noted, and the memorials of them laid up in our archives, so that our successors may not only be able to write the history, but have a perfect panorama, of the age in which we live.

The collection of such memorials was a favorite object with the founder of this Institution; and our Library probably contains a more ample store of them, in the form of newspapers, pamphlets, and tracts of every description, than is elsewhere to be found in this country. Such contributions are always acceptable; and the Council have recently passed an order for

arranging and binding the large and confused residuum of them lying in the basement of our Library, so that the same may be rendered accessible to all who visit our Institution, whether from motives of pleasure, or the purposes of research.

The PREAMBLE to the charter of this Institution, that ancient and useful prefix to acts of legislation, recites, that, "Whereas the collection and preservation of the antiquities of our country, and of curious and valuable productions of art and nature, have a tendency to enlarge the sphere of human knowledge, aid the progress of science, to perpetuate the history of moral and political events, and to improve and interest posterity; therefore be it enacted," &c. The general objects of this Institution could not be better stated; and so far as relates to the "collection and preservation of the antiquities of our country," and the provision of an eligible depository for them, this Society has well answered the objects of its creation.

But it would be quite too narrow a view of those objects to limit them to the collection and preservation of antiquities, whether in the form of a library or a cabinet. All that may have been done in the cloisters of the middle ages. But those ancient repositories of science and the arts, though they have preserved much, have also lost much. Hume has somewhere said that the monks had many ancient books that are now lost. They had an ample apology for it. They had no means of multiplying, and thus preserving, their books,

but by the slow and arduous labor of the copyist; and, when fire or the sword invaded their common sanctuaries of religion and of learning, a blank was left, which no future exertions could adequately supply. But for the modern institution, whatever may be its objects, no such apology exists for a loss of the fruit of its labors. The cunning hand of the printer and graver has come to the rescue from any such calamity, and has taught that the way to preserve knowledge is, not "to bury it in the graves of our forefathers," nor yet within the walls of the library or the museum, but to render it accessible to all, and to diffuse it, as far as it can be done, by the combined power of the pen and the press.

These views, it is believed, were entertained by the founder of this Society, and by those who early co-operated with him in the promotion of its appropriate objects. Accordingly, we find that in 1820 the Society published the first volume of its Transactions. With a wise forethought, their first attention was directed to the fading memorials of the men originally inhabiting the territory of the United States. The leading article in the first volume of their Transactions, was a contribution from Caleb Atwater, Esq., of Circleville, Ohio. It is a valuable and interesting tract upon the antiquities of the West, and particularly of his own State. The work was most opportunely undertaken, and will be gratefully and effectually preserved in the printed transactions of this Society.

Since the work of Mr. Atwater was thus accomplished and recorded, the axe and the plough have been busy in effacing the last memorials of the original tenants of the beautiful and populous State of Ohio. But one monument of that race is recollected, that promises lasting preservation: it is the large mound in Marietta, which the people of that city have, with much good taste, enclosed with the circumjacent grounds, as a cemetery. The sides and summit of the mound are neatly laid out with walks, and planted with evergreens; and thus this mysterious monument of a more mysterious race of men, has come to be decorated and preserved by the muniments erected by modern civilization and Christian sympathy. The spot here referred to, must always be regarded as a point of much interest, and not less to the antiquary than to the tourist for pleasure.

In the year 1842, the remains of the supposed fortifications, situated between this mound and the Muskingum River, as pointed out by the late Dr. Cotton, of Marietta, and so graphically described by Dr. Thaddeus M. Harris and others, were so far effaced that none but the scientific traveller would be likely to notice them.

The second volume of the Transactions of this Society appeared in 1836. Amongst other matter, this volume contains a synopsis of the Indian tribes of North America, with copious vocabularies of their languages, &c. This paper was contributed by the

late Hon. Albert Gallatin, and is a valuable addition to American archæology.

Mr. Gallatin stated, in a prefatory letter, that the work was undertaken, in 1823, at the request of his distinguished friend, the Baron Alexander Humboldt, who had himself been an extensive traveller upon the American continent. That he should thus early induce our distinguished countryman to engage in a work of so much labor, and such surpassing interest to the American archæologist, entitles him to the special gratitude of our countrymen, as his own great works command the respect and admiration of the whole civilized world.

The Society have, from time to time, been advised of the progress of another work prosecuted under their auspices by Increase A. Lapham, Esq., of Milwaukie. It is a survey of the aboriginal remains peculiar to the State of Wisconsin. The surveys of Mr. Lapham were completed in a very satisfactory manner, and his manuscripts and drawings had been prepared by our Librarian for the press, when an arrangement was made for their publication by the Smithsonian Institution.

The work of Mr. Lapham is to be published in a separate volume, that will be ready for delivery by the time of our annual meeting in October next. This work will be looked for with much interest, but will become a more appropriate subject of remark when it shall have reached our Library, and

been submitted to the examination of the members of the Society.

Allusion should here be made to the publication of the first number of the third volume of the Transactions of this Society. The leading object of this publication was the preservation of the records contained in the first volume of the proceedings of the Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England. The number referred to, embraces the earliest portion of those records, commencing in March, 1628, and coming down to March, 1630, when Governor Winthrop sailed with the charter from England, and the government of the Company was transferred to America. A prefatory chapter furnished by our Librarian, giving a minute account of the formation of the Massachusetts Company and of its several members, together with copious notes to the exact printed copy of the record, give great additional value to the work thus commenced by this Society.

In 1853, the Legislature of this Commonwealth ordered the printing of the first two volumes of those records, which work has been executed under the editorial care of a learned member of this Society. This circumstance caused a suspension of the publication on our part, but, it is believed, affords no sufficient reason why the proposed third volume of our Transactions should not be completed at an early day, of which the number now published, consisting of 250 pages, would constitute a valuable leading article.

Such a volume of our Transactions, together with the volume referred to that is about to appear from the press of the Smithsonian Institution, will satisfy kindred societies, that, though we work silently, we work efficiently, in promoting our common objects.

During the past season, two interesting communications have been made to the Society at informal meetings of its members. The first, by Samuel Jennison, Esq., was a biographical notice of James Ralph, of Philadelphia, the early friend and associate of Dr. Franklin. The name will be familiar to the readers of the doctor's pleasant Autobiography. It is sufficient here to say that Ralph fully justified the doctor's estimate of his genius; went to England with him in 1724; became a favorite of the Prince of Wales; wrote not only poetry and political pamphlets, but a history of the reign of William III., that had the good opinion of Charles J. Fox; was honored by a notice in Pope's "Dunciad;" received a pension; and died at Chiswick, near London, in 1762. Such sketches are the more valuable when the subjects of them were from among the early inhabitants of our own country, and such as would be likely to escape the notice of the general biographer.

The other communication referred to, was from Mr. Haven, the Librarian of the Society. It was a learned tract upon the various opinions as to the origin of the population of this continent, with an elaborate citation

of the authorities by which the various theories upon that subject are attempted to be sustained.

These two manuscripts were referred to the Council, and will constitute valuable and appropriate material for the next volume of the Transactions of this Society.

Of our future operations it is difficult to speak with much definiteness: they must depend upon circumstances, and especially upon the means placed at the disposal of the Council for prosecuting the objects of this Institution. Of one thing the Society may rest assured, — that, under the present administration of its affairs, no considerable debt will be contracted to embarrass the action of its successors.

For the prosecution of researches in the archæology of the United States, the Society have adequate pecuniary means. For this and other specified purposes, the provisions contained in the will of Dr. Thomas dedicate the interest of five thousand dollars. That interest has not all been expended. The Report of the Treasurer will show that he has an excess of it in his hands, amounting to $10,247.32. It will be the pleasure as well as the duty of the Council to avail themselves of the earliest and best opportunities for promoting the objects thus liberally provided for.

Our explorations for ancient remains have heretofore been mostly limited to the States east of the Mississippi. Now that our unquestioned national domain is extended to the Pacific, we have new facili-

ties for making similar examinations in that direction, wherever proper objects of antiquarian research may invite. In such a work, the officers of our army stationed in those regions, many of whom are highly educated men, would have it in their power to render valuable service to this Society.

But the appropriate sphere of our labor is not limited to our own country. As the American Antiquarian Society, we may claim, without poetic license, that the "boundless continent is ours." At the time of this present writing, it is understood that we have a national vessel navigating the waters of the Paraguay and the Parana, and that diplomatic negotiations are in progress for the introduction of our commerce into those rivers and the waters of the Amazon. It would belie the history of the world, if the arts and the explorations of science did not speedily follow in the track of our commerce. Indeed, our ingenious and indefatigable countryman, Mr. Catlin, is already upon the head waters of the Amazon, with pencil and pallet in hand, sketching the persons, costumes, and implements of the aboriginal tenants of that region, whose grotesque shades are probably destined to decorate the walls of the Smithsonian Institution at Washington. As the metropolitan institution of the country, possessing peculiar advantages, not only from its connection with the government, but by its ample means, it is hoped that the guardians of that institution may early direct their attention to the interesting field of

research here referred to. With kindred institutions, whether their object be to collect or to diffuse knowledge, emulation may exist, but competition never. A contribution to knowledge by one, will always be a matter of rejoicing to all.

Researches as to the languages and customs of the aboriginal tribes of Central South America will probably confirm, what is, indeed, already a well-founded opinion, that all the different Indian races of this continent had a common language, and hence a common origin. But from whence did they derive that origin? or is their origin American, underived, and independent of the continents of what we have been in the habit of regarding as the Old World? This is, no doubt, the most interesting question in American archæology; not to the antiquary merely, but to the whole of the new race of men that are so rapidly supplanting the old one. There will be no rest upon the question, even in the popular mind, until some predominant public opinion upon it is formed, right or wrong. It is the business of the antiquary to aid in forming a right opinion, and to give right reasons for it. At present he can intelligently assert but two conclusions upon the subject, — the one, that all the Indian races on this continent had the same language and the same origin; and the other, that, some nine hundred years since, the Northmen of Europe paid a nautical visit to the Northmen of America. This latter fact, however, is more of an historical than an

archæological character, and merely shows that this continent was accessible from the East, affording but little other proof that it was settled by a people coming from that direction. The older and more favored theory is, that the original inhabitants of the American continent were of Asiatic origin. This theory probably arose from a consideration of the near proximity of parts of these continents, and the comparatively easy communication between them. And it is a remarkable fact, that at this moment there exists a section of our extensive race of Esquimaux Indians upon the west side of Behring's Straits. So that, however it may be as to the original immigration of the Indian race from Asia to America, if it be not so, America has, by some means or other, sent a colony to Asia.

It must be confessed, however, that the theory of the Asiatic origin of our Indian race, rests more upon this ground of general probability than upon any very specific proofs, whether of an historical, archæological, or traditionary character. It becomes a matter of great interest, therefore, to the American antiquary, to inquire whether such proofs exist, and, if so, how they are to be developed.

In solving the problem as to the common origin of our Indian races, great aid was derived from the researches of our learned countrymen, Mr. Pickering, Mr. Du Ponceau, and others, into the affinities of the different Indian languages. Such affinities were found

to exist, so far as examinations could be made, and the conclusion in favor of a common origin of the races became obvious.

The same course of reasoning suggests itself as a legitimate mode of establishing an affinity between our Indian and the Asiatic races. Nothing is so tenacious with a people as their forms of language and their religious customs. But, as the connection between races of men becomes more remote, the development of such proofs becomes more difficult. Dr. Barton, of Philadelphia, and other learned philologists, have instituted this mode of reasoning for the purpose of identifying our Indian and the Tartar races of Asia. Striking affinities between their languages have been discovered; but a conclusive deduction upon the subject, requires further research and a larger accumulation of facts.

The facilities of our countrymen for prosecuting researches in this department of American archæology, have been greatly increased within a few years past. We have now more than a thousand miles of coast over against the continent of Asia, and the Pacific islands, confessedly of Asiatic origin. Our commerce is almost literally at home in those extensive and interesting regions, and is inviting men of science to unite in exploring them. The Japan Islands, long *terræ clausæ et incognitæ*, are just opened, not only to the enterprise of the merchant, but to the researches of the scholar; and a fair opportunity is now offered

to test, by philological proofs or otherwise, the truth of the ingenious, but perhaps fanciful, theory, that the archipelago of Japanese and Aleutian islands were the stepping-stones upon which the forefathers of our Indian race made their exodus from Asia to America.

Or if we suppose, with many learned archæologists, that there was a people inhabiting this continent long anterior to the Indian race,— the authors of our mounds and other ancient works, whose ancestors learned their art at the great mound where the confusion of languages took place, — that theory would receive singular confirmation from the additional discovery of those mysterious structures along the supposed highway of national immigration to our continent.

Inquiries of this sort, it is obvious, would involve the necessity, not only of much local research, but of resorting to the sources of archæological and philological facts, in relation to both the eastern and western continents; and while, for the treasures of the one, resort would become necessary to the collections of the Asiatic and other learned societies of Europe, the sources of the other would be found in the libraries and transactions of this and other kindred institutions of our own country.

It will be perceived that the object of these remarks is not to state, much less to discuss, the different theories as to the origin of the population of this continent, but to allude to some departments of antiquarian

research, for the prosecution of which our countrymen possess peculiar facilities.

The Librarian, in his Report, will renewedly present to the Society the considerations in favor of the early publication of a new catalogue of our Library. It is a subject upon which he, in common with the librarians of the other principal institutions of the country, has, of late, bestowed much attention; and little more is necessary than to refer the Society to his present and his former reports. The last catalogue of our Library was published in 1837. Since that time, the material of our Library has nearly doubled, and a reference to its valuable contents has become inconvenient and embarrassing. The volumes of the Library have now taken their new resting-places, which it is hoped they may quietly occupy for ages, except as they may from time to time be disturbed by the diligent hand of the inquirer after truth. So far, then, as the state of the Library is concerned, the present is an opportune period for the publication of a new Catalogue.

But it is a work that will require much labor in its preparation, and no inconsiderable outlay for its publication. And in this connection the Council ought to say, that the current and accumulated interest of the twelve-thousand-dollar fund, the only fund from which we can properly draw for the purpose of defraying the expense of such publication, is quite inadequate for that purpose, after answering the other necessary

purposes for which it is charged. It is true, the Council might borrow the requisite amount from the accumulated interest of the five-thousand-dollar fund; but such is their aversion to contracting any debt, that they would not owe one even to themselves. The only debt they hope ever to owe is that of gratitude to their benefactors; and, for the payment of that, they cheerfully pledge their renewed efforts to promote the objects of this Institution.

For the Council,

IRA MOORE BARTON.

Boston, April 25, 1855.

# Report of the Treasurer.

THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY RESPECTFULLY REPORTS,—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| That the amount of Funds in his hands at the date of his last Report, October 14, 1854, was | | $28,226.36 |
| Since which time he has received — | | |
| For Interest on Notes and Dividends on Bank Stock, the sum of | | 1,079.68 |
| For Copy of Colonial Records from the State | | 340.00 |
| | | 29,646.04 |
| In the same time he has paid — | | |
| For premium on Bank Stock purchased | 2.50 | |
| For Coal | 84.85 | |
| For Portrait of Gov. Davis, and framing the same | 64.75 | |
| For Plate-glass and setting | 9.23 | |
| For making Drain | 28.21 | |
| For setting Curb-stones | 7.46 | |
| For Expenses of Mr. Haven, in journey on the service of the Society | 26.08 | |
| For T. Dinsmore's Bill for Advertising | 10.75 | |
| For Printing Semi-annual Report, paid John Wilson & Son | 39.01 | |
| For Sundry Expenses paid by Mr. Haven, as per his account | 91.11 | |
| For Land purchased, &c. | 105.25 | |
| For Librarian's Salary, six months | 450.00 | |
| For Treasurer's Compensation, one year | 30.00 | |
| | | 949.20 |
| Balance | | 28,696.84 |
| Which is invested as follows: — | | |
| On account of Fund of $12,000: — | | |
| In Notes with Mortgage | | 10,700.00 |
| In Blackstone Bank Stock | | 500.00 |
| In Citizens' Bank Stock | | 1,100.00 |
| In Fitchburg Bank Stock | | 600.00 |
| In North Bank Stock (Boston) | | 500.00 |
| Cash | | 49.52 |
| | | 13,449.52 |
| On account of Fund of $5,000: — | | |
| In Citizen's Bank Stock | | 400.00 |
| In Oxford Bank Stock | | 400.00 |
| In Quinsigamond Bank Stock | | 1,600.00 |
| In Shawmut Bank Stock (Boston) | | 3,700.00 |
| In Worcester Bank Stock | | 1,400.00 |
| In Notes with Mortgage | | 7,465.00 |
| Cash | | 282.32 |
| | | 15,247.32 |
| Fund of $12,000 | | 13,449.52 |
| Fund of $5.000 | | 15,247.32 |
| | | $28,696.84 |

SAMUEL JENNISON, *Treasurer.*

April 17, 1855.

# REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN.

---

The Librarian has to report an addition to the Library, since October last, of one hundred and thirty-eight volumes of books and one hundred and forty-two pamphlets, besides a variety of other matters, such as sheets of laws, collections of broadsides, handbills, cards of business and ceremony, engravings, unbound newspapers, &c., which have a permanent value when assigned to their proper place and connection.

The sources from whence accessions have been received are as follow: —

| | |
|---|---|
| Usher Parsons, M.D. | Providence, R.I. |
| Rudolph Garrigue, Bookseller | New York, N.Y. |
| John Russell Smith, Bookseller | London, G.B. |
| E. B. O'Callaghan, M.D. | Albany, N.Y. |
| The Senate of the United States. | |
| Sylvester Judd, Esq. | Northampton. |
| Miss Ann Clark | Northampton. |
| George Brinley, jun., Esq. | Hartford, Conn. |
| The State of New Hampshire. | |
| The Library of Harvard College. | |
| James Lenox, Esq. | New York, N.Y. |
| Mrs. John Davis | Worcester. |

Eleazer Johnson . . . . . Newburyport.
Frederic W. Paine, Esq. . . . . Worcester.
Rev. Preserved Smith . . . . . Deerfield.
Rev. Edward E. Hale . . . . . Worcester.
Bernard Quaritch, Bookseller . . . . . London, G.B.
Rev. Amory Gale . . . . . Lee.
Hon. E. G. Squier . . . . . New York, N.Y.
Hon. R. C. Winthrop . . . . . Boston.
The Smithsonian Institution.
Rev. Josiah P. Tuston . . . . . Savannah, Ga.
Messrs. Jordan and Norton . . . . . New York.
George H. Gray, Esq. . . . . Boston.
Charles Scribner, Bookseller . . . . . New York.
J. Wingate Thornton, Esq. . . . . Boston.
John Jay Smith, Esq. . . . . Philadelphia.
The Boston Mercantile Library Association.
The San Francisco Mercantile Library Association.
The State of Massachusetts.
The American Unitarian Association.
The Editors of the New York Quarterly.
The American Philosophical Society.
Neville B. Craig, Esq. . . . . Pittsburg, Pa.
The Massachusetts Horticultural Society.
The New York Mercantile Library Association.
Rev. William B. Sprague, D.D. . . . . Albany, N.Y.
Aaron Clark, Esq. . . . . Thompson, Conn.
Hon. William H. Seward . . . . . Auburn, N.Y.
Charles Deane, Esq. . . . . Cambridge.
John C. Warren, M.D. . . . . Boston.
Hon. Samuel L. Crocker . . . . . Taunton.
Tal. P. Shaffner, Esq. . . . . Washington, D.C.
The American Peace Society.
The American Baptist Publication Society.
Hon. John Wentworth, M.C.
William Brown, Bookseller . . . . . London, G.B.
The Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane.
The New Jersey Historical Society.
The Maryland Historical Society.
The Trustees of the Massachusetts General Hospital.
The Pennsylvania Historical Society.

The Author of "Taghconic."
The United States Congress.
Samuel H. Congor, Esq. . . . . Newark, N.J.
Hon. Alexander De Witt . . . . . Oxford.
Francis Jackson, Esq. . . . . Newton.
J. Hammond Trumbull, Esq. . . . . Hartford, Conn.
The Trustees of Deerfield Academy.
Samuel Jennison, Esq. . . . . Worcester.
Miss Eliza Appleton Haven . . . . . Portsmouth, N.H.
Charles J. Hoadly, Esq. . . . . Hartford, Conn.
The Mercantile Library Association of Cincinnati.
Thaddeus William Harris, M.D. . . . . Cambridge.
John L. Sibley, Esq. . . . . Cambridge.
The University of New York.
Trübner & Co., Booksellers . . . . . London, G.B.
G. Parker Lyon, Publisher . . . . . Concord, N.H.
The Trustees of the City Library of Manchester, N.H.
Mr. F. B. Eaton . . . . . Manchester, N.H.
Martin Paine, M.D. . . . . New York.
Edward Warner . . . . . Northampton.
Rev. George Allen . . . . . Worcester.
Elisha Fuller, Esq. . . . . Worcester.
N. B. Shurtleff, M.D. . . . . Boston.
Société de Géographie . . . . . Paris.

The Editors of The Boston Semi-weekly Courier.
„ The Christian Watchman and Reflector.
„ The Semi-weekly Advertiser.
„ The Fitchburg Sentinel.
„ Hunt's Merchants' Magazine.
„ The Worcester Spy.
„ The Worcester Ægis.
„ The Worcester Journal.
„ The New York Churchman.

Some valuable additions have been made to the series of early laws and legislative journals of this Commonwealth. The imperfect condition of these

important political and historical documents in all the libraries of the State has been sufficiently commented on in former reports. Our own efforts to supply deficiencies continue to meet with encouraging success; and especial thanks are due to a member of the Society residing out of Massachusetts (George Brinley, jun., Esq., of Hartford, Conn.), for the efforts he has used, and the liberal assistance he has rendered, towards the accomplishment of this object.

Taking warning from experience of the careless manner in which the printed documents of legislative bodies are wont to be treated, and the frequent gaps that usually exist in their series, even in the official departments where they are supposed to be preserved, the Society has, from time to time, tendered its shelves for the reception of such publications, and its care and attention to their security. An additional advantage has been offered to the several States and to Congress, in the plan of associating collectively the legislative records of the whole country; thus combining with security from the chances of loss the great convenience of simultaneous consultation. It must be admitted that the purpose for which these documents are printed can in no way be so effectually promoted as by multiplying the places where they shall be deposited under such circumstances.

This desirable end cannot, however, be attained without efforts repeated and continued. The subject has been frequently dwelt upon in previous reports;

and, whenever it has been brought forward, some beneficial consequence has followed. Since its mention in the last report of the Librarian, two gentlemen, J. Hammond Trumbull, Esq., of Connecticut, and I. A. Lapham, Esq., of Wisconsin, have written to place their exertions at the service of the Society for the regular transmission of the documents of their several States. Mr. Trumbull has already forwarded ten volumes, dating from 1851 to 1854, inclusive, as an earnest of what he is disposed, and may be able, to do hereafter. Some unknown friend has sent five volumes and a number of legislative pamphlets from New Hampshire. We have long been accustomed to such favors from Rev. Dr. Sprague, of Albany; and it is probable that more reliance can be placed upon private individuals than on public officers for regular and sustained attention to these agencies.

The council are therefore respectfully reminded of the benefit that may accrue from endeavors to enlist the good offices of personal friends or acquaintances in the capitals of the several States.

The regular journals and proceedings of the Legislature of Massachusetts, at the last session, have been received from the office of the Secretary; but, for the five volumes of the Colony Records recently sent to the Library, the Society is indebted to the personal kindness of the editor, Dr. Shurtleff.

The "Relations" of the early French missionaries were spoken of in a former Report as rare and valua-

ble historical documents which we had not the good fortune to possess. Mr. James Lenox, of New York, a member of the Society, has recently sent to the Library a volume of these tracts printed at his private expense. Some are reprints from very scarce copies, and one has never before been published. It is very possible that single numbers or odd parcels of these "Relations" may fall in the way of members of the Society, who, unless attention was drawn to them, might not be aware of the interest they possess to this institution. They would be exceedingly acceptable here, although of little importance in a private library.

A few volumes have been purchased; and some excellent works have been obtained in exchange for duplicate books and pamphlets of less value to the Society.

It is very desirable that our unbound pamphlets should be put in a shape to be made more available in this way. When it is found that there are duplicates, or, as is often the case, triplicates and quadruplicates, of the same publication, it frequently happens that they may be exchanged for productions of equal or greater value of which we stand in need. It would be useful, therefore, to have prepared a list of duplicates, whether books, pamphlets, or newspapers, as soon as practicable, noting the number of copies, and their condition with respect to completeness.

Before this can be accomplished, a good deal of

labor is required, in the room where they are stored, in assorting and arranging such accumulations; and a reasonable expenditure could hardly otherwise be so well employed as in reducing to order those somewhat untractable materials.

Experience shows that, for security and convenient reference, all pamphlets that are not duplicates should be put into binding. The expense is heavy, and often seems to exceed the value of the material; but there is no evading its necessity, and no estimate of the worth of any production can be regarded as a fair criterion for the future. Even among contemporaries, what one would reject as worthless another might esteem of superior importance; and with posterity, that which is despised now has the greater likelihood of attaining to the dignity and consequence of an object of virtu. It has been suggested, as an economical mode of accomplishing the binder's work required in a library, that, when enough material has been collected to make it, in business phraseology, an object, a man should be employed by the month in the building itself. A favorable opportunity is thus afforded of effecting such slight repairs as are always more or less needed among books in use, and thus a greater expense at some future time be avoided.

There is another matter that deserves to be attended to in this connection. It is frequently urged upon this Society that a complete list of its entire collections should be printed and distributed for the convenience

of persons engaged in historical researches. About five years since, the Librarian was instructed to consider the expediency of publishing a new catalogue of the Library. Aware that a matter seeming to the inexperienced easy and simple was approached by those better informed with seriousness proportioned to the knowledge of its difficulty and the responsibilities it involved, Professor Jewett, of the Smithsonian Institution, was applied to for advice respecting the proper system to be pursued. The attention he had given to the subject abroad and his experience at home had enhanced the natural value of his judgment. It was just at the time when the question, how a catalogue should be made, was so violently agitated in England with reference to the library of the British Museum; a debate which resulted in the decision, that a satisfactory catalogue could not be published without an expenditure of time and money greater than its utility would justify, and that an imperfect one, besides the discredit attending it, would answer very little useful purpose. Hence most of the great libraries of Europe are without printed catalogues.

It should be stated that this decision was restricted to libraries of reference without circulation. In a constantly increasing library, it was argued that no printed catalogue would determine that any particular book was not in the collection, as it might have been subsequently added; and as any book that was there

could be examined only on the spot where the manuscript catalogue could be referred to, it was better to rely wholly upon that, resorting to correspondence to ascertain the presence of any book desired, and depending upon bibliographical lists for information as to what works have been written on particular subjects. To these considerations was added that of the small circulation to be anticipated for an expensive catalogue; showing that its utility, even under the most favorable view of its advantages, must be extremely circumscribed.

Professor Jewett was then engaged in maturing a plan of publishing, on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution, a general catalogue of all the works to be found in the libraries of this country.

This scheme aimed at a number of results of the highest interest and importance. As a bibliographical guide, its value would be exceedingly great. It would secure uniformity in the expression of titles, and the best and most accurate method of expression. It would reveal the literary deficiencies of the country, and lead to their supply; and, under the system of execution proposed by him, it would save the labor of repeating the title of a book in the list of every library where it might chance to be.

Our application gave additional stimulus to Prof. Jewett's exertions. It is well known that he proceeded to develop his view of the principles that should govern the construction of a catalogue; that

it was approved by a commission of which our late President, Hon. Edward Everett, was chairman; and that a mode of stereotyping was devised, having among other advantages that of greatly reduced expense. With such facilities, it was proposed that every title of a book should constitute a type by itself, movable and transferable, so that it might be used, not for one particular catalogue only, but for all in whose lists these titles were found.

It was also proposed that the Smithsonian Institution should become the stereotyper and publisher of the catalogues of all the libraries of the country, retaining the stereotypes of the titles, with a constantly diminishing necessity of adding to the number, till ultimately it would be able, not only to issue a general catalogue of all the libraries, but to furnish at a comparatively trifling cost to institutions perfect lists of their own collections, and just the number of copies that their immediate wants might require.

The Commission to which the subject had been submitted by the Smithsonian Institution made a report highly approving the entire scheme of Prof. Jewett, and recommending that the library of Congress should be the first to which the bibliographical principles and the mechanical devices of the plan should be applied.

Another reason why it was thought best that a publication by the Antiquarian Society should be deferred for a time, existed in the fact that a general

catalogue of American works was supposed to be on the eve of completion by Mr. Henry Stevens, of London. In 1848 the Society subscribed a considerable sum towards the expense of this enterprise, not to be paid, however, till the work was ready for the press. One part of the plan of Mr. Stevens was to note, in connection with each title, the principal libraries where the book might be found. Partly to avoid disagreement in the phraseology of titles, and partly on account of the assistance to be derived from this catalogue, it seemed desirable to have it precede that of this Society.

And, finally, having regard to the convenience of preparation, every possible diminution of such a labor being worth considering, it was deemed advisable to postpone the whole matter till the Library should be removed to its more accessible accommodations in the new building.

The last-named contingency has happened, and the books and pamphlets are in a favorable situation to be subjected to whatever processes the compilation of a new catalogue may require.

It is understood that some progress has been made in preparing a catalogue of the library of Congress; but the sum appropriated for the purpose by the National Legislature is nearly exhausted, and a further supply will be required for the continuance of the work. Circumstances also render it propable that no definite time can be assigned for the reduction,

to a practical and operative system, of those mechanical arrangements that have been referred to.

It appears, moreover, that the enterprise of Mr Stevens has been suspended, or its completion deferred, for an uncertain period.

The circumstances under which the action of this Society, in reference to printing a new catalogue, was postponed, have therefore materially changed; and the question seems now to rest on its intrinsic expediency.

The principal objections are, that the expense would be very considerable; that the diffusion of information by such means is limited by the small circulation to be anticipated for such a work; that this is a library of reference simply; and, as books are consulted in the building only, a manuscript catalogue answers every necessary purpose.

On the other hand, the contents of our Library are of a somewhat peculiar character, and there is no general catalogue or bibliographical register of American publications to guide the inquirer who is looking for sources of information local to this country.

A very large portion of our list consists of the titles of tracts and minor publications, that have not heretofore been preserved to any great extent, or registered individually in other institutions; a circumstance that imparts to our catalogue a peculiar bibliographical interest, and renders it a very acceptable object of distribution.

As there are remaining a good many bundles of the sheets of the catalogue of 1837, it may be necessary to print only the new titles that have been added since that period, which are, probably, about equal in number to those of the former work.

If the publication of a fully descriptive catalogue, on the most approved scientific principles, is deemed too great an undertaking, there are examples of a condensed form that are regarded as very serviceable and satisfactory. An index to the contents of the Public Library of Boston, of that character, was issued last year; and an excellent compressed catalogue of the Mercantile Library has been printed, where each title occupies but a single line, but every book is entered under the name of its author, and also under a word or phrase expressing its subject-matter, so that, if either the author, the subject, or the title, is known, it may be easily found.

The most economical course, and that which involves the least expenditure of time, is simply to print a supplement to the present catalogue, in which case it would probably be advisable to conform to the system there adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL F. HAVEN.

# SPIRIT COMMUNION:

AN IMMOVABLE FACT

IN THE

## INTERNAL CONSCIOUSNESS

AND

## EXTERNAL HISTORY OF MAN,

BEING AN ADDRESS,

DELIVERED IN THE REGULAR COURSE OF PUBLIC MINISTRATION, IN NASHVILLE, TENN., APRIL 15, 1855.

BY J. B. FERGUSON.

PUBLISHED AND CIRCULATED GRATUITOUSLY BY M. W. WETMORE.

NASHVILLE:
M'KENNIE & BROWN, PRINTERS—TRUE WHIG OFFICE.
1855.

# SPIRIT COMMUNION.

PRAYER.

All-helping Spirit, aid me to think clearly and speak impressively to these, Thy creatures. Our humble power of Thought, with its immortal instincts, we would now turn to Thee. Our knowledge is very limited; our judgment imperfect; our love grows cold, and our hearts harden in selfishness; while our feet often wander in the thorny paths of wrong-doing and sorrow. Give us the wings of faith and pure desire, that we may, for this hour at least, fly away from the perplexities of weak and misguided judgment; the oppression of care, and the heart-stings of unworthy affections and fears. How wide, O, God! the gulf between the clear skies of Thy unfailing love, and the low, dark, clouds of our ignorance, and the benighted places of our gross indulgences! But Thou dost pity and help us, as our souls bear testimony every day. Thy beneficent smile, spread o'er the face of Nature, gives rays of light to our dark pathway; and the inspirations of Thy good Spirit warm our hearts to love and adoration. Unreservedly would we commit ourselves and our interests to Thy guiding wisdom, hopefully trusting that we shall be taught that truth which shall never die; gain that treasure which shall never corrupt; secure that faith that shall always deliver, and that delight, angelic, that shall illumine the gateway of death with hope eternal! O, fit us for the heavenly light and life. May we feel the impulses of immortal souls, and anticipate, with satisfying foretastes, the welcome and bliss of our future

homes. Bless us with desire and power to bless others, in both word and deed. May we feel poor with Thy poor, lonely with thy orphans, sorrowful with Thy cast down and disconsolate ones, that we may be elevated together. May sickness, distress and misery find us ever ready to minister, both with our sympathy and substance. May our lives be more consistent than our words can possibly be, and become sermons of practical devotion to duty and praise. And in the inner depths of our souls, may we feel Thy peace, so pure, so full, that we may triumphantly pass, amid all conflict, to that glorious Heaven to which Thou hast lifted our purest desires and holiest anticipations. And to Thee, everblessed Father, be the glory eternal—Amen.

---

## ADDRESS.

And now, having prayed, we have scarcely faith enough in ourselves, our fellows, or in our God, to proceed. The chilly influences of the cold and selfish controversies of the religious leaders of the people, incapacitate us to speak with living power, and to hear with meditative and inspiring interest. They have suppressed Thought, and the suppression of Thought is the most deadly infidelity possible to the human mind; it is the heresy of heresies, and the atheism of the church. By Thought we are elevated above the brute; take our appointed rank in the scale of accountable being; gain the agencies by which to purify our grossness and ally ourselves to all Christ-like intelligences and God-like purposes. It is the talisman of power to the human soul, and only in its free exercise can it be loving and helpful amid the trials of a frail humanity. It alone can make Truth our own conviction, duty our personal choice, holiness and Heaven our desire and delight; for it is the medium alike for all earthly and heavenly influences upon rational intelligences; for all earthly, as the negative basis upon which, and in which, the pure positive power of God may operate to secure our refinement and progress, and the

advancement of the world. Let us charitably hear, then, that we may judge justly and act considerately toward all the influences and persons with which we have our discipline.

There is a very current, and, in many circles of society, a somewhat popular idea, that all light upon man's spiritual or immortal relations, was made to shine in the past ages of human history, and that it is alike irreverent and preposterous to seek further knowledge or confirmation in the higher developments of mind and triumphs of knowledge, that have marked succeeding, and characterize the present generations. We esteem this idea as the offspring of a false, not to say idolatrous reverence of the past, tending to enslave and degrade human nature, and corrupt the native birth-right and holiest privilege of the soul: the birth-right of Thought, and the privilege of forming our convictions according to the light we enjoy from the ever-unfolding and eternal sources of wisdom and help in God. The idea is predicated upon an absurdity. It is, that the nature of God is changeable. For, if God be the same, and his purposes without variation, then it cannot be possible that one mind in one age can arrive at the knowledge of Truth, and another mind be denied the privilege. In other words: what is possible to one mind, under the same conditions, is possible to all. If, therefore, God is the same, and the human mind the same, no discovery of Truth possible to one age, can be rendered impossible to another. Every attainment, therefore, gained by Prophet or Philosopher, is but a revelation of a possibility to any mind equally true to its nature and privileges. Beside, the opposite idea would make God a respector of persons and peoples, and thus give foundation for all the partial, passionate and revengeful character ascribed to him by the childish systems of Heathenism, and the sectarian controversies and creeds of Christendom, which the enlightened votaries of each can never believe to be true, and which the enslaved receive more with fear, than either hope or faith.

Again: The idea that all religious truth is confined to a past age, and that all we have to do is to memorize and

interpret, (or, if I might speak from the practical effects of that interpretation, I would say,) or quarrel over that truth and its application, is founded upon a mistaken view of Truth itself. It supposes that Truth can be mapped and bounded, can be limited if not exhausted. It is the common mistake in childish life, when we imagine our home the universe, our parents and friends the greatest of mankind, and our interests and pleasures the full measure of the purposes of God. It is pardonable in a child—is evidently necessary for his dangerous and disciplinary stages of progress; but here, as in all things, we should seek a state of Thought and Piety in which to dispense with childish things. Truth never was exhausted—never was made less. The spiritual relationships of man are infinite, because they connect us with God, who is connected with all. We cannot embrace the idea of *one God*, without being compelled to this thought; and hence, the knowledge of God is the eternal life of the soul, for it connects it with all life, and its progress consists in finding, using and enjoying that connection. Whoever made a truth less by stating it, or applying it? The estimate of it may have been made less, as in the vain attempts to circumscribe all truth in a creed, but the exhaustless fountain flows on, and as it flows forever will flow on; for its source is in God, the All of Truth, to whom we are connected as we are assimilated more and more to His nature and perfections. We may discover truth, but we cannot create it. We may apply it in exquisite and beautiful skill; but we can never exhaust it. And every man being born with an immortal nature as a semblance of his God, is born with immortal instincts for God's truth; and only as he sees and uses it for himself, is he happy, hopeful, or *man-like*. He, for himself, and not for another, has his God to find and adore; the Christ-like spirit, or anointing of that God to enjoy and increase, and the endless chain that binds him to the spiritual universe, to discover and brighten. This I know, though once I knew it not; but the knowledge I cannot directly impart, for no one could impart it to *me*, as *my* experience, however blissful it may have been, as *theirs;* but I can state it, after the manner of the ancient Prophets and Apostles, or after what I am

permitted to call my own. Here is the place for the testimony of experience, and this can never be surrendered. We may become false to it, for Judas betrayed his Christ when he betrayed his brother; and every religious persecutor does the same; whether consciously or unconsciously, depends upon his degree of opened soul, or his attainment in the stature of Truth. Truth is immortal—not as a figure of speech, a beauty of poetry—but in its nature immortal. It knows no diminution, no corruption, no perversion, no death. We may diminish ourselves in its knowledge and power; we may pervert and enslave our faculties to discover, receive and enjoy truth; we may corrupt our minds and hearts so that they almost, or quite cease to reflect it. In a word, we may degenerate to the dull, sensual plane of bruteism, and seek to hallow it by the holy name of Christ and God, or Humanity and Heaven. But God and Truth remain the same, and we never come to enjoy either until we become true to ourselves and the Truth-like, God-like impress of Divinity we bear. Sacred and inviolate, like the pure sky above us, it lives; and though clouds may hide it from our eyes it hides it not from itself. As men become more true to themselves, to the nature they inherit, to the universe of which they form a part, they ascend in harmony with its eternal laws, and behold what men less true, idolatrously worship, or distastefully blaspheme, or fight over.

Truth is the same in nature, though infinite in the degree of its reflections. Mathematics is the same in its nature, but how wide the degrees of its reflections in the negro, who cannot tell the number of his fingers, and La Place, who calculates the lines of the stars; and, yet, who would compare either to the mathematics of God? Music is the same in the lonely murmuring of the forest brook and in the anthem of Bethoven; yet, who could ever rationally think of music as exhausted in its sweet melodies and enrapturing harmony. Poetry is the same in the rude ballad of the Druid bard and the lofty conceptions that flow through Harris; but eternity will never exhaust its power to move and elevate. Philosophy is the same in the Mexican, who lubricates the wheels of his cart from the bark of the elm,

and in the sublime reasoning of Davis; but its field is the universe, and its lessons are for all time. So, Jesus, and every spiritually illuminated soul, declares truth, but does not exhaust it—performs many wonderful and loving works, but ever promises, in that very performance, that his disciples shall do greater.

We reverence the past, then, because it reveals the links in the chain of an eternal Providence; but we use the present as our day, that the chain be neither buried nor broken; for we too, live, move and have our being in God, as well as they who have passed through the earthly life, and our day will answer for us as well as it will for them, according to our fidelity and devotion.

Now, these truths are so simple, so self-evident, that we wonder that they should ever be questioned; but we do not wonder at the terrible results that inevitably follow wherever they are disregarded. Dark and fearful despotism in government; furious and bitter scorning and persecution in churches; frowning and hideous superstitions in religion: families separated; knowledge despised; science neglected, and the earth mourning beneath the inhabitants thereof, who deliver the assassin and crucify the Saviour, are the dread issues of a prostration of reason, and a disregard of the eternal privileges it secures. But, perhaps, it would be well to note some of the common appeals by which it is justified.

Because the Bible contains many divine disclosures, and is made the foundation of much that is good and indispensable in human society, therefore, a very plausible appeal is made to popular prejudice in opposition to every disclosure upon man's moral and spiritual relations, as if it would subvert the morality and religion man instinctively regards. But this appeal presumes upon an unwarrantable ignorance, and thus shows itself more fatal to the good order of society and the elevation of man, than any perversion of a real privilege can possibly be. We have need only to ask: Has not every discovery in science and skill in the arts been condemned by the very men who were enjoying their advantages, under the influence of the blind bigotry and slavish

reverence of those who were the professed and consecrated expounders of Bibles and Records? Is the Bible, then, opposed to knowledge? Does it fear the light? Can a communication from God be endangered by spreading it before the world? Is man capable of judging for himself? and if not, who are they who presume to judge for him? What lineage do they bear that gives the right to lord it over the consciences of their fellows? Are they not *men* of like passions and frailties with their kind? Let their history and present position answer.

But, in answering this last question, we probe this difficulty to its core. We extend the question, and ask, from whence came this Biblical record? What favored ages in human history does it cover? What are the sublime and heavenly practices that characterized its heroes? Were they *men* or gods? Or, if more under the influence of Truth than others, was it not because they were more true?—more true to themselves and their God?—that is, more true to the same minds we bear, the same universe we live in, the same God *over* and *in* us all.

Let us open the Book and see, for we have studied it from our childhood. It tells us that man was created perfect; that he fell, and the vast majority of its devotees say so fell as to involve himself and all his descendants in a depravity of nature that exposes him to all the ills of the present life, and to the pains of endless torture in the life to come. Here, we ask, can nature be depraved? Character may be, but how can God's own nature, which man is represented to have received by Divine inbreathing, be depraved? Can you corrupt the Deity? This is like corrupting or exhausting Truth? But farther: the world degenerates; God grieves that he created it; destroys it with a flood, only to make its condition hopelessly worse in the hell beyond, and saves one man and his family. We would expect that this man would be pure, and better fulfill the ends of creation, that seem, upon a first experiment, to have failed. But what does the sequel prove? He worships, it is true; but lies down in drunkenness and obscenity, and rises up to curse the child that laughs at his folly!

But you will tell me that he is not a good example? I answer, is Abraham, denying the wife of his bosom, and repeating the denial? Is Jacob, wrenching the paternal blessing from a tender and starving brother by deceiving a blind father? Are Judah and his brethren, in their envy of Joseph and his sale to the traffickers in human flesh of those days?

Or, is Moses the object of your admiration; for he, as the others, is worthy on many accounts. Behold him, like a thief in the night, casting his eyes before and behind, and then slaying the Egyptian. Perhaps David, whom the record says, "was a man after God's own heart," is free from the mortal taint. Read the 109th Psalm, and answer to your own consciences and to your God. He prays that his enemy may be condemned when judged; that the iniquity of his father and the sin of his mother may not be forgotten; that his innocent wife may be a widow, and his unoffending children beggars; that an executioner may catch his goods; that his posterity may be blotted out, and that God may never forgive him! Now contrast this with a descendant of his, who lived a God among such men, who, in the agonies of a shameless crucifixion, prays to *his* God to forgive the vilest of enemies; for, says he, "they know not what they do." Would Noah, or Abraham, or Moses, or David, have desired their enemies with them in Paradise, as Jesus promised one of the vilest of mankind?

But why refer to these facts? It is to show that the mortal frailty to which you and your kind are subject, belonged to the men who wrote, and who are biographically sketched in your Bible. Divine truth is in it, we do not deny, but rejoice to believe and prove upon all fitting occasions. But human error is equally manifest, and its shadow is cast in the selfishness, bigotry, and cruelty of the present age. The Bible Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles, delivered truths in exact proportion as they were true. You do the same. Where they failed, we should not fail; where they attained to spiritual knowledge, peace and joy, we may attain, and glorify the same exhaustless Providence that made John the Baptist superior to Moses and the Prophets, and which,

through Jesus, in word and deed, reveals the truth, "that the least in the kingdom of Heaven may be greater than John."

Are we true to our nature, discipline, opportunities and privileges? If so, what is our hope? Is it built upon a record that covers a period of some five thousand years, and fragmentary at that—that has been handed down from generation to generation without the facilities for printing and preserving that you possess—that has been collected, altered, added to and subtracted from, according as ambitious monarchs and corrupted priesthoods have felt inclined or believed would best subserve their interests?—a record appealed to, to substantiate the claims of every conflicting sect, from the Romanist to the Mormon? Or do you build your hopes upon the cultivation of your own nature by its aid and all other aid; and if so, do you not commune with the immortal friends that have gone before, as did Abraham, Moses, John, and all the prophets, whose authority you have so blindly reverenced? This is the question. If with all their faults and frailties they communed with the spiritual world, how claim you to be their disciples, while I would hope, with less impurity, you know not the end of your earthly pilgrimage, and deny the possibility of knowing? If God is the same—if the human mind is the same—if the ancients, who, with their faults recorded, enjoyed this privilege, why do you not enjoy it?

I testify, then, in common with hundreds and thousands of this age, that the privilege still exists, and its advantages, like the advantages of every privilege in nature, depends upon our faithfulness to ourselves, to our nature and to God. Its purposes and ends need not be stated, for they would not be believed, except as we come to appreciate and enjoy this natural birth-right and indestructible prerogative of every human being.

But, am I told we have never seen ministering spirits, and our ears are never saluted by their heavenly voices? I answer: Have you ever seen God, or Christ, or the Prophets? And is sight the measure of human knowledge and bliss? Do you deny the existence of an ocean, because you

cannot see it? Does the reality of blindness, or limited vision, destroy the light of heaven and the glory of God? And so every objection you urge—and you ought to urge them to yourselves, at least—will but reveal the solemnity and power of that greatest of all truths, that in the exact proportion in which we are faithful to ourselves and the god-like faculties we possess, God, and Heaven, and heavenly influences find their reflection in us.

But some will say within themselves, would that we could believe Spiritual Communion possible to us as well as to the ancients. It would give new hope, new life and vigor to our souls; it would span with new prospects, the troubled ocean of our thought, and reveal the truly sublime purposes of our being and earthly discipline; and we, too, would come to feel those sacred affinities that unite all in one kindred in God. It appears as an indispensable nutriment to our souls, and yet overburdens our thought. We should no longer live in doubt, nor die in fear, but stand as men in God, to relieve, and not to increase the misfortunes of our kind. The roots of our thought would go down beneath encumbering forms that oppress the soul, and with new prospects we could seek the elevation of all our race. This power, we admit, belonged to Christ and the Apostles, but did it not die with them?

We would say, in reply: no truth can die; no true privilege can be finally lost. This privilege did belong to Christ and the Apostles, for they lived true to the Divinity within them, and the powers it granted to that truthfulness. They lived near the departed, conversed with them in their holiest hours, and by their aid healed the sick and comforted the distressed. Why, then, if we were equally true, equally hopeful, equally pure, equally reliant upon God in all, could we not come as near our departed? Our grosser nature alone, hinders *our* approach. All that can be necessary for the benefit of man is within our grasp; but skepticism, intolerance, priestly rule, and wrong in ourselves, with overwhelming force, condemn us to that devotion to self that absorbs the life of the dead and the purity of the living, to mourn over wrecked hopes and prostrated powers. We

have seen the sick healed, the lame walk, and the decrepit strengthened, wrongs corrected, errors overcome, servitude supplanted by freedom, and doubt removed, by positive intercourse with the spirits of those who were bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh; and all in witness to the truth of the light now breaking everywhere upon the nineteenth century, and in promise of the glory of God to cover the earth with a new-born race, to be immersed in a spirit of truth and love that will sweeten the souls of all, wipe the tear of sorrow, and sow the seed of hope in the most desolate hearts. And we know that if our minds could be entirely harmonious with the benevolent purposes of our God, agencies exist to carry forward this work to an extent and to ends that never entered into the imagination of the most hopeful.

But, in the face of these undeniable facts, what are we told; how are we met? "If the good spirits come to administer to our good, may not the evil come to tempt us and lead us astray?" I ask this objector, where is your faith in God? He never permitted this; by which I mean, he so constructed the mind, and the universe of visible and invisible ministrations to its development and power, that like will seek like, "with unerring aim." It is true, man may deceive himself. He may degrade himself so low that nothing but the low can gratify him. He may mistake the answers of his own mind for the responses of spirits. But he knows and feels his self-deception whenever true to himself. No undeveloped spirit ever intrudes upon those who seek Light and Hope. This is the message we have from all, and we have never met with an exception. Prattling innocence, and hoary experience testify at our hearthstones, every day, and under every variety of circumstances, that, as *we are* and as *we become*, in purity, in faithfulness, in hope, so are our kindred in God drawn to us, to still further elevate and increase our powers, both to bear and to do, to behold and to testify. While all bring the inspiring assurance that this Light is now dawning upon the hilltops of every land, and to use their own language, "but a few silent watches of the night, and the distant dawn will proclaim the

epoch of a brighter day, to fill the heart with joy and illume the soul with a resplendent orb, whose penetrating rays shall give life and vigor to the parched earth, from whence shall spring a joyous birth of gladness that shall bind together all men in unison to their great end in God. Its epoch is already here." From ten thousand seeing, hearing and impressible minds, in every quarter of the globe, and without reference to any partizan views of religion, government or selfish interest, this announcement is being made, attended with a weight of evidence such as was never given to any fact of your belief.

We tell you this calmly—we pass by all outside statements that we are crazed, are fanatics, or selfish schemers. We leave you and all to judge of the justice of such reflections. We live, and labor, and move among you, and you know whether it be true or false; and we assure you, that such charges excite us not, not because we are not as other men, but because we know whereof we affirm, and feel that Truth is the birth-right of man from his God, and will yet prevail over our follies and yours, and that it is our mutual duty to prepare to receive and apply it. We ask of you no compensation for our testimony, whether spoken or printed. Gratuitously we print and circulate what we receive to the extent of our means, and in some instances beyond them. Not one cent of profit has any Spiritualist in Nashville, either directly or indirectly, received for his labor or expense, in speaking or publishing in this cause. Of many in other places, this is equally true, and if of any it be otherwise, we know it not, the current representations to the contrary notwithstanding. And we ask nothing. Though poor in this world we have been made rich in the evidences of an immortal estate, and expect to sustain ourselves in temporal matters as others, esteeming it a privilege that amply compensates for all apparent sacrifices, (for they are but apparent,) to spend and be spent in elevating the hope of a common brotherhood.

Nor, can we promise ourselves any exclusive honor or personal elevation. We have no privilege that is not open to all, for all have departed ones making a kindred in God.

We have no attainment that greater faithfulness upon your part will not make greater to you than ours is to us. And surely to be feared by our friends whom we have loved and served with uninterrupted devotion; to be held in doubt by thousands who hear of us as demented or worse; to be watched in our every word and act; surely, surely, this could offer no inducement to our testimony. And yet, we esteem it the highest honor to say, that a Blessed Light, which shall be to all people, is now dawning, and its evidences are open to all, while not made necessarily dependant upon any. Already, consciously or unconsciously to the people, it influences all the movements of the age; controlling some—directing others—affecting all, from the war in the Crimea, to the humblest efforts of the lowliest creature of God, seeking spiritual light and help.

Nor do we abandon any honorable avocation for this privilege. It comes from the God who made us to eat, drink and sleep, and provide for our natural wants. Nay, it gives us holier views of the humblest calling; and assigns our natural wants and duties their proper place, neither engrossing our souls nor dwarfing our bodies. Less demands but little, and our animal are sure to be our lesser wants. "As nature needs, so nature feeds;" and through our spiritual being, our higher nature, it gives admonition of all we need for ourselves and others. Is there a Spiritualist of your acquaintance, I mean one who claims to have daily spiritual privileges, whose business, family, or citizen duties show the least neglect? Think and answer for yourselves, before you believe the false tales of insanity, &c., huckstered to the rabble. Your wise men predicted we would all be insane; proposed enlarging your asylum for our benefit, and your foolish men believed the prediction, and are astonished that it is not fulfilled. Now, tell me, did you ever see a person made insane by Spiritualism? Are any of your Spiritualist neighbors in any sense injured by this privilege. You cannot point to one either here or elsewhere.

Spiritual life reveals the sacredness of our identity. We are taught that "the spirit of the prophets is subject to the prophets." We too, have fears for the sanity of any medium

developed through inharmonious relationships, and permitted to attempt to gratify the unbounded curiosity of idle and superstitious visitors. We have seen such, and feel that we have prevented most terrible results, by showing them the folly of attempting to gratify what never was and never can be gratified. We must say, by the prerogative granted to every man, to Spiritualism as to every other great fact, depart, when other duties and responsibilities claim our attention. We cannot control the rain or the winds, but we can build our shelters and adjust our sails. No man will be injured by spiritual privileges if he preserve his individuality; any man may be ruined by it who yields it *even* to spirits. It is the wise adaptation and application of any great truth that leads to good results. Steam is not responsible for explosions, but engineers are. So Spiritualism is not responsible for lunacy, but men who ignorantly or wilfully abuse it are; and for one, I desire to be held to the most strict responsibility for any evil that may occur under my application of it, but not for any other man's.

But you will tell me that the light of Spiritualism is so obscure—so much mystery connected with it—so vague—so unsatisfactory. Is this your fault, or ours? Or, rather, is this our fault, or that of spirit monitors? A block of wood will cast its shadow. Should human minds be expected to do less? Every truth, upon every subject, shows its contacts with the channels through which it flows. To us, the teaching is pure, uniform, and opens, as our minds open and our practices tally in virtuous conduct and benevolent aims. We were made to *learn;* not to *pry* into mysteries to boast of our attainments, and lord it over some less favored brother. Hence, we must seek *in the Spirit*, if we would gain of the Spirit; and how few there are who do this! "Whatsoever is of the Spirit is Spirit."

If Spiritualism were what many foolishly suppose it to be —did it take the place of our reason, our power of thought, or judgment, it would, indeed, curse us with insanity, and doom us to the hopeless ignorance that ever fears a Devil, where, a higher illumination, would worship a God. Spiritualism is a revelation of a law of God in man, inscribed by

an angel host, and its disclosures come to us to invigorate, and not destroy the souls we bear. Purity of mind and honesty of purpose are its indispensable conditions, as they are the only incentives to virtue. Spiritualism reveals God in all things—the Beginning, Life, End of all. If in all, in us by the Spirit he has given us; and as we open, purify and elevate that Spirit, it finds its kindred in all that surrounds it, and its infinite relationship to those cherished ones that are ever near it. We may behold diversity, then, but no contradiction. We may have endless variety, for the life and destiny of man is various, but all tends to the same end—viz: THE GOOD OF MAN!

The light of Heaven is not less pure because variously reflected by the objects of sight around. The inscriptions of Divine wisdom and goodness upon the Heavens that overarch our every horizon, are not less perfect because man fails to see the glory of his God, imprinted there. Different degrees of capacity and circumstances, reflect from the same light, different impressions. The Temple of Freedom may be erected in the brotherly and sisterly regard of those who have passed from our sight, but we may fail to come near enough to share its pure light and undimmed glory. We should rejoice that we have, in spiritual approach, a light, which, in its apparent divergences, adapts itself to different conditions and occupations. This fact may reprove our selfishness, but it will improve our spiritual sympathy. Capacity, however, will not always measure immortality; "for the day is not distant when the evidence of Spiritual Communion will be as plain as these heavens, and as firm as this earth, and radiate man in God!"

But, says another, "what you claim is miraculous, and we cannot believe in miracles." Nor do we believe in miracles in the ordinary and philosophical meaning of that word. That is, we do not believe that God violates his own laws. Nature, in its principles and results, is of God. But spirit, with us, is nature also, only a higher form than the external manifestations usually called by that name. Nature is of God, and therefore perfect for all the ends he contemplates. Its laws are his laws, and therefore, whenever

we define miracle to be a violation of any law of Nature, our definition makes it a violation of the law of God—an absurdity. For if God be perfect in working as in purpose, the whole of Nature, as his work, must be perfect. Consequently, any violation implies imperfection, either in the one or the other; and our minds revolt at the idea, in the exact proportion in which they are true to the law of God written within us.

But the lack of faith in a miracle as a violation of the law of God, does not, necessarily, imply or produce a denial of the event, or fact, called miraculous. It depends upon its own evidence, and our faith upon the knowledge of, and faithfulness to that evidence. Which, simply stated, is, that we do not make our own capacity, or that of others, the standard of Divine operation—another absurdity.

What are called miracles, therefore, may have been performed—may have disclosed a law of Nature higher than those previously recognized, and even so much higher as to overbear, or take the place of some inferior method, and yet there is no violation.

Thus, what is wonderful to one degree of culture, or point of observation, may be miraculous to another; and what strikes one mind as a disclosure of a higher law, may strike another as a violation of a lower one. The true or false conception is the result or lack of cultivation.

If, therefore, Moses, the Prophets and Apostles of Israel, performed miraculous works, or were made the instruments of disclosures and powers never before recognized, it was by a knowledge of, or a connection with, powers of God, (or Nature, if we prefer an inferior name,) higher and superior to those previously known. Miracles, then, as the result of a higher law of Nature, we believe; but miracles, as a violation of Nature, we deny, and do so with a confidence, which is, to us, the highest form of faith in God, or Divine perfection, possible to our minds. And we would modestly suggest that this distinction meets alike the difficulties of the honest skeptic and the conscientious dogmatist.

Allow us to illustrate: It was a miracle of wisdom and power to a North American Indian, to see a ship moving

over the waves of the ocean in safety, bearing men and animals comfortably, from some unknown region, to his native shores. It was a miracle of kindness from God, and of skill in man, to produce a field of waving grain—to reduce it to an inviting meal, and find in it a means of sustenance and pleasure. It was a miracle of Prophecy to foretell an eclipse, and the fall of his nations, and the rise of another so essentially different in population, arts and social characteristics. But were these miracles to a cultivated European? Were they not the result of a knowledge of higher powers of the same Nature, and of the same Divinity in Nature; and especially in man, as its noblest external manifestation? Unquestionably so. Just so the wonders of the Bible record, so far as they are accurately recorded, are disclosures of a higher law than that known or used by those who called them, or still call them, miracles in the sense of a violation of law. To deny a prophecy because we cannot make one, would be as rational as it would have been in the Indian to deny a ship because he could not construct one, or to deny the golden harvest because he knew not the laws of Nature or mind by which it was produced. All religionists, of every dogmatic creed, will agree with us here. Can they be true to themselves and deny what follows? To worship the man who performs the miracle of instantly healing the sick, or who delivers a clear and unmistakable prophecy, or discloses a new axiom of wisdom, or a new application of an old one, or to worship the miracle, would be equally absurd, and would, in nothing, essentially differ from the Indian's worship of the ship or the husbandman.

God is in all things, and as his Divinity opens in us we see his power, and are prepared to use it in all that surrounds us. In the plant that grows, and the star that burns; in the food that sustains and the medicine that relieves life; and we find the one and appropriate the other, as our minds open to that Spirit of all Wisdom, whose dwelling is everywhere; whose confinement is nowhere.

If a miracle be true, and I believe it not, it is easy to see where the difficulty lies. If the report of it be false, and I believe it, does not the mistake still lie in me?

To be true to myself, therefore, is to be true to all things, as I come in contact with them, and they with me—is to be true to my fellow and my God.

Let me not say, then, I believe in Christ unless I do, and let me not hesitate to affirm it when I do, and to what extent, and upon what evidence, whenever and wherever it is made my clear duty to avow my faith. Now, then, at this moment, from as careful an examination of all the evidence without me, and in all the exercise of the powers within me, I solemnly affirm that I believe in *the Christ* that dwelt in Jesus of Nazareth, as the brightest and purest manifestation of Spirit in Humanity—that it was of God, and in this sense, was God; and that to the extent, however limited, in which the spirit of any human being opens in wisdom and love, it is also of God, and is God—the wisdom is God; and its powers are his powers, and will secure as great and greater works, as time and Providence may require; and that when his spirit shall be unfolded in all, God will be Christ in all, and every human soul feel and know and forever rejoice in the ties of that kindred in all, which is God manifest in humanity—the fullness of his Spirit filling all things. And so may it be; and may we grow daily to receive our measure in the Divine fullness! Amen! and Amen!!

If we believe, then, let us speak—if we believe not, our own darkness condemns us, and in every serious hour, the immortal instincts of our nature will seek for LIGHT! Beneath the radiations of Spiritual Light, we will yet see the broad streamer of Life Immortal, waved as by angel hands, high over all the clouds of ignorance and injury.

"And so our life will flow
From its mysterious urn, a sacred stream,
In whose calm depth the beautiful and pure
Shall yet be mirrored; then when shapes of ill
Shall hover round its surface, it shall glide in Light,
And take no shadow from them!"

# A DISCOURSE,

DELIVERED

IN THE FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

BY THE REV. THEODORE CLAPP.

"I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance. Likewise I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."—*Luke*, xv: 7 and 10.

Christianity has unfolded to us a greater number and variety of beautiful and grand ideas than have entered the human mind from all other sources. It furnishes more lovely and magnificent pictures for the imagination than all the poetry of ancient and modern writers combined. To some it may seem but extravagance and folly to refer to the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, and the Gospels, as affording specimens of the highest poetical charms and glories. Having, now, no time for illustrations, I can only say that I make the remark with the most perfect conviction of its truth.

Further, Christianity contains the elements of a science, sublime, transcendental, and I may say, boundless. The ideal of the profound and comprehensive philosophy taught

by Jesus, very few, comparatively, of the human race, have, as yet, received in their widest and loftiest imaginings. This, perhaps, is not to be wondered at. "Life is short, and art is long," says the old proverb. Christianity has been so narrowed and vulgarized in the general thought of mankind, that it is very hard to draw attention to the true forms and proportions of its peculiar wisdom and beauty. There are other difficulties in the way. Imprisoned in these tabernacles of clay; moving almost upon the same spot, from the cradle to the tomb; surrounded by the innumerable frailties and limitations of a mortal lot; enveloped from the beginning, in the thick, heavy mists of sin and ignorance, that settle down on these dark shores of time; having been brought up under narrow, circumscribed, prejudiced, perhaps, sectarian and bigoted influences; from the suitable age, having been devoted so exclusively to secular pursuits, mankind at large have not availed themselves of the requisite opportunities—have not read enough, thought enough, studied enough, prayed enough to become initiated into the rudiments of the Gospel revelation. And those belonging to the clerical profession, have, to a great extent, it is feared, spent much more time in exploring the philosophy of the peculiar systems of faith which they have advocated, than in the faithful perusal of the New Testament writings.

It seems to me that the leading thoughts which pervade and characterize the discourses of our Saviour, are the following: First: There is only one God, one uncreated Being, possessed of infinite power, wisdom and goodness—undivided and indivisible—the Maker, Ruler and Father of the Universe. Secondly: His moral essence is unmixed, unchanging love, commensurate with the boundlessness of his attributes and works. Thirdly: All spiritual intelligences in the Universe are united to Him by ties of affection, which can never be broken. Fourthly: One moral, accountable being, is just as important in the sight of God, as another, however sinful or insignificant he may appear in the sight of men. The vilest sinner in our city is of equal consequence to Himself and the Universe, as the highest angel who has never sinned. Fifthly: The family of man

are so bound together in origin, character, sympathy and destination, that one cannot be saved unless all are saved. Or Jesus came not to save a definite number, but to redeem entire humanity. Sixthly: Our sensibilities and kind deeds towards any person, should be just in proportion to the depth of his sin, sorrow and unworthiness. These are a few of the great principles of the Gospel, in part expressed, and in part implied in the passage of Scripture selected for the theme of our meditations this morning. "There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." How different the sources of happiness in that upper world from those of earth! What occasions the greatest joy among men? Enlarged means of selfishness and luxury—the inebriating cup—the sumptuous banquet; wealth, rank, fashion, genius, learning, the creations of art, military triumphs, and the various distinctions which flatter our pride, ambition, or vanity. There, the reformation of the meanest, lowliest, guiltiest, most despised sinner of New Orleans, would inspire the celestial hosts with the highest transports of which their bosoms are capable—greater, more thrilling, than those which were felt on that eventful day spoken of by Job, "when the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy" over the creation of a new family of planets, as they began to wheel in grandeur their ever-enduring and harmonious courses through the fields of space. Who can grasp in conception, or worthily paint in words, such magnificent realities? I cannot offer an idea, fact, argument, illustration, or analogy in support of the text. It is a subject, altogether beyond the ken of mortal minds. It rests upon the simple assertion of the Son of God, who, as we believe, uttered only the words of truth. I shall attempt to show that the text, properly understood, sheds important light upon the following subjects: Christian sympathy, a christian life, and a christian hope.

Christian Sympathy is a strong, lively, tender sensibility to the sins, wants, degradation, injuries, sorrows and distresses of our fellow beings, accompanied with an earnest desire and consistent efforts to relieve them. It is the noblest endowment we can possess. It is the loftiest attri-

bute of God, Jesus, the Holy Spirit, angels, the general assembly and church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven, and the spirits of the just made perfect. It is the germ and element of all true greatness. It is the only source and means of a happy, useful life. As to religion, our emotional attainments are much more important than the intellectual. A minister may stand in your pulpit, of moderate abilities and learning, yet, if his soul is imbued with the large and generous spirit of the Gospel, his preaching will be effective. His words will go from the heart and reach the heart. If you feel right, my christian friends, every day duties will flow from you free, pure and sparkling as the sweet waters of a perennial spring. Happy is the man whose moral sensibilities are ever lively, who never allows them for an hour, to intermit their depth, fervor, tenderness and strength.

In order to show the connexion between this matter and the text, a few explanations are needed. One of the severest forms of our moral discipline as christians, arises from the fact that we are continually brought in contact with those faults and follies—those multifarious errors and transgressions abounding among men, which tend to discourage, impair, and even destroy the feelings just described. I will illustrate: With many of us, one of the first things done in the morning, is to look into the newspapers to see what has passed in the great world to which we belong. We spread out the document, and find many shocking recitals. In one place is an item of cruel murder, committed under the most atrocious and aggravated circumstances. In another, we see the words, "bold and daring robbery," or an account of incendiarism, which has destroyed a vast amount of property; or an appalling suicide, or a flagrant breach of trust, &c. Now, imagine a perfect christian, who has spent his life in some secluded vale, surrounded by none but the good. He has never heard of such a thing as a newspaper. For the first time, one is put into his hands, and he is told that it is a picture of what is going on in the great world beyond the narrow district to which he is confined. When reading the things just named, what would

be his feelings of unutterable horror? Would he not shudder and grow sick at heart? But what is their effect on you, my friends? What is their effect on me? I am ashamed to say that, though I don't read them attentively, yet, as my eye glances over the record, I detect in my bosom, a sort of apathy, or coldness, which says, "What is that to me?" or, what is there in robbers or assassins, that I should take any interest in? And perhaps some professing christian finds these dark paragraphs more agreeable and edifying than any matters else which the paper contains.

Or, we turn to the head of foreign intelligence, and read an account of another sanguinary battle between the great belligerent parties that are now acting a most fearful tragedy in the South of Europe. We think of the prowess of formidable and thoroughly disciplined armies, aided by all the resources of modern improvements in the art of killing, engaged in the work of mutual destruction. What a contrast between these scenes of carnage and blood, blazing battlements and groaning hospitals, with all the horrors which follow in their train, and that Divine love which the Son of God exemplified in his mission, teachings, life, death and resurrection? Again, we betake ourselves to the head of domestic news. From this we learn that some gentleman, hitherto of unblemished reputation, a bright star in the galaxy of illustrious men at the north, has been guilty of an extensive fraud, by which he has carried desolation into the crushed and bleeding hearts of a large circle of widows and orphans, and by which he has robbed hundreds and thousands of the humble, dependent classes of their last pittance.

We need not multiply these instances. You perceive the idea I would convey. These incessant experiences, every hour, day and week, of the iniquities, the moral wrongs that disgrace our world, and the consequent, almost inevitable exasperation of our minds, tend, beyond all calculation, to chill and freeze the warm current of generous and benevolent emotions, which should ever flow through the heart of a christian, and constitute his peculiar glory, O! how hard it is, in a world like this, to live so as to keep our noblest

sensibilities from waning, so as not to allow them, under any emergency, to intermit their depth, fervor, strength and tenderness. It is easy to talk and rail against the sinner, in or out of the pulpit. But without due commisseration for his state, this is of no use whatever. It even does hurt. It is ruinous to our spiritual welfare. It prevents us from looking with a proper frame of mind, with calmness, composure, hope and trust, on that dark, inscrutable, eddying current of sin and sorrow, which is hurrying along so many millions to the ocean of eternity.

Again, there is another obstruction to our feeling right as to sinners, which arises from one of the most potent laws of our mental constitution—the law of association of ideas, as it is called. You have a neighbor who has lived by you for thirty years. He is universally loved and respected. He has great weight and influence in this community. No cloud of dishonor has ever settled down upon his house, fortunes and fair name. Suppose that to-morrow some astounding disclosures should be made, convincing the public that, for a long time, he has been carrying on a system of stupendous frauds? Or, let it be, that, like Professor Webster, of Boston, he should be left to commit a homicide of the most unjustifiable and dreadful character? Before next Monday night, he falls like a star that sets to rise no more. His guilt is acknowledged. Now, how hard would it be for you not to join in the general execration and regarding the *person* of the offender with all the detestation which the thought of his misdoing must awake in your bosom? You will be inclined to do so by an almost irresistable impulse.

In such a crisis, the text furnishes us with an infinitely exalted standard of action. We are reminded that angels walk with us unseen, for they could not sympathise with man if their residence was far off in some distant, remote orb of this or any other system. Further, they behold with a clear, instinctive, unclouded perception, all the moral evil on earth. They witness the scenes which I have just described—all these acts of dishonesty, evasion, circumventing reckless indulgence—all those dark struggles of hate, envy,

pride, malice, and ambition. More, they look upon these doings with infinite oppugance—an oppugance as much greater than we can feel as heaven is higher than earth. But, how do they regard the sinners themselves, who have done these deeds? With all that gentleness of spirit which becomes an angel—with unmixed, tender pity—with deep, and all-subduing love; with that dignified and almost inconceivable elevation of character, which mixes with the greatest displeasure of the offence, the liveliest compassion for the offender. And the strength of their sensibility is in proportion to the depth of sin, sorrow and unworthiness, which are its objects. In the case of the imaginary sinner just mentioned, deserted by the whole world, in the sight of man an insulated fragment of hopeless ruin and disgrace, the tender yearnings of angels gather around him, as he is crushed to the earth, and will never forsake him until he is made fit for admission to their own glorious, exalted abodes.

Nor are we left in doubt as to the basis on which their sympathies rest. They cannot be actuated by a weak, unfounded, morbid sentimentality. "Sons of the Morning," they estimate things according to their intrinsic value; they love only what ought to be loved. They sympathise only with that which is entitled to their highest consideration. Their feelings to the poor sinner arise from the fact that he is just as important to God and the Universe as the loftiest cherubim who has never sinned. They see that his destruction would work out infinite ruin to others. Philosophers say that the smallest particle of dust cannot be spared—that if annihilated, the great globe itself would perish. So, in the spiritual universe, there is not one intelligent being, whose ruin would not involve that of millions more. The sinner cannot be spared. If he be swept away, the post which he was ordained to fill will be forever vacant. No other person can move in the circle that he was created for. Omnipotence can preserve, but cannot destroy one thing without destroying all others. In that case, it would be necessary to put away the old system entirely, and reconstruct a new one. The great sympathy spoken of in the text, is not simply the sinner's importance, as endowed with

a divine, immortal spirit, but the eternal necessity of the relation which he sustains to the glory of the Creator, and the perfection of his Universe.

Next, we may derive from the text an expanded view of the principles essential to a christian life. To be a christian, implies something more than the performance of mere duty. We have a case directly in point. We are told that a young man came to our Saviour, who had kept all the commandments of the decalogue from his youth up, with the most scrupulous exactness, yet he was devoid of the elements of the higher spiritual life which Jesus unfolded. The truth is, this life underlies duty; it is the subsoil, or substratum, of those plants which bear the foliage, fruits, and blossomings of immortal virtue. Jesus Christ did not outline a system of duty. He laid down no moral code. He did not specify a particular precept which may not be found in the writings of Moses, and even pagan authors who lived hundreds of years before the Advent. The glory which he revealed could not be put into a few commandments, any more than the whole atmosphere which sustains all animated nature could be pressed into this little chapel; yet a christian will not neglect a single duty. He will be just, pure, sober, and mindful of all the obligations that bind him to his family, friends, and the world around. Beyond this, he must soar to tread the beautiful fields of philanthropy. Paul tells us that the Son of God lived in heaven before he visited our world, but he gave up those inconceivable glories to become man in the humblest possible form. In the original, it says that he emptied himself, became impoverished, of no reputation, submitted to shame, indignity, suffering, and the cross—and all this for our sake. His life is the model to be imitated by all true disciples. They must look around upon the community to which they belong, with noble and generous pulsations of heart; they must feel themselves to be identified with the interests, welfare and happiness of their neighbors. A right-minded person would as soon think of living a life of open, criminal avarice or sensuality, as to lavish upon personal indulgences, exclusively, the means which God has bestowed on him, partly, indeed, for himself,

and partly to be the instrument of promoting the general cause of human virtue and happiness.

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus refers to the sun as the best type and symbol of the Father's love and beneficence? That potentate of the system—that imperial orb—the king of day, is entirely unselfish. Without compensation, He sustains the worlds that roll around him, imparting to each, whether good or bad, the various means of life, order and beauty. He then bids his disciples to aspire after a life equally noble and beneficent. There is nothing selfish in the Universe but sin. Look at a flower: it lives, not for itself alone, but imparts fragrance and beauty to all within the sphere of its influence. It is a token of infinite love. It ministers to the healing art. It is a favorite at weddings and funerals, at the evening party, the concert, and the assembly room. At the north, a vase filled with the loveliest blossoms is set upon a table before the pulpit during the performance of Divine service. We place them upon the tombs of the departed as the emblems of immortal affection and bliss in a future world. Really, a flower subserves more beneficent purposes than are accomplished by many of the human race. The dew-drop of the morning, which reflects the color of the rainbow, is not born for itself alone. Its mission is to aid in keeping alive and beautifying the vegetable world. The ocean is not selfish: From that immense reservoir, come mist, vapor, showers, rivers, lakes, and innumerable other things which minister to the wants, convenience and elegance of life. When we breathe, we always exhale a poison. This church, in one hour, if air-tight, with the number of persons now in it, would be filled with a deadly gas, in which we should instantly expire. Why is not the whole atmosphere in this way spoiled—rendered unfit for respiration? Because the leaves of the trees, and all vegetable forms, live on this poison. What we create they consume. What would be death to us is life to them. So, through the whole of Nature's domain and activities, there is not an insulated thing. Each object leans on something else, and finds its health in promoting the welfare of that on which it depends. So, the tie of a com-

mon beneficence should cement the members of the spiritual creation. And nothing should make a christian more unhappy than the thought that he fails, by not making consistent and noble endeavors to scatter the greatest amount of beneficence along the path in which he walks, according to his condition and circumstances, and the treasury of means which God has ordained for his use and charitable disbursement.

From the text we may learn something important concerning the nature of a true christian hope. It is of great consequence, to know whether our habitual hopes are founded upon the promises of the Bible, or the principles of Natural Religion, merely. What is a christian hope? Does that man possess it, who expects only that himself and family, and a small circle of intimate friends—his little church, and the few other churches that harmonize with it in principles, will be saved, and all the rest of the world perish? Is that a christian hope, which holds that the day is coming, when our Creator, in the exercise of a stern, unrelenting hatred to sinners, will arise and cut asunder the ties that unite them to a throne of grace, and allow them to drift out from the shore of peace and safety upon the surge of perdition—driven onward, onward and onward, till finally they will get beyond the reach and resources of even Omnipotent Mercy. Is that a christian hope which denies that each person is bound to his neighbor with affections so intimate, endearing and enduring, that he cannot be perfectly happy himself, so long as he sees others perfectly unhappy? Is that a christian hope which flays the great body of humanity alive, and strews its ruptured, lacerated and bleeding fragments upon the wide field of utter ruin? Is that a christian hope which immures one part of mankind in the great central dungeons from which they are never to be let out, and forbids the remainder to proffer the poor boon of condolence and sympathy in behalf of partner, children and friends, who, by a cruel and inexplicable fate, are severed from them forever.

I would not trouble myself about mere speculative absurdities. Let them be endured so long as they leave me a God

whom it is in my power to honor and adore; so long as they allow me to love my fellow beings and embrace them in the arms of faith; so long as they do not rob heaven of all that can make heaven desirable. But when theology lays a rash and ruthless hand upon the keystone of that beautiful arch of mercy that spans our fallen world and towers high into the golden skies; when she divides the human race into two parts, whose interests are to be eternally antagonistic; and after narrowing down the number of the finally saved to an inconsiderable fraction, cuts off all communication between earth and heaven, and holds that saints and angels will cease to sympathise with human sufferings, but that through eternity they will lift their voices in more rapturous hosannas, as the wailings of wo and despair come up from the countless myriads of the lost; then I thank my Heavenly Father that I may look upon its dictates as a dream of dark and superstitious ages gone by.

And what a dream! To have it on the mind but for a single night, is enough to unsettle—dethrone our peace and reason. But a true christian hope is founded on the text, that the return of one sinner causes joy in the presence of the angels of God, and consequently, that the loss of a single sinner would clothe that world in mourning. Sublime thought! He who turns a sinner from the error of his ways will forever partake of the joys of this new-born, ransomed spirit, and their common joy shall vibrate through the intelligent creation. Sublime thought! The conversion of the lowliest, meanest sinner in New Orleans, this morning, would send a thrill of rapture upward—reaching even the millions that surround the eternal throne! This is the basis of christian hope, that entire humanity must be redeemed before one human being can be perfectly happy. A man's weal or woe is forever identified with the race to which he belongs.

The joy of Heaven is not yet complete, else it were not capable of being increased by the repentance of a single sinner. Hence, the conclusion is irresistible that the joy of the celestial world will not reach its maximum, so long as a single sinner in this or any other part of God's universe

remains impenitent, unredeemed, unsaved, unblessed. This, therefore, is the true Gospel hope, that the system of grace revealed in the New Testament, will go onward, and onward, till, in the mighty roll of future ages, it has reached the case of the most desperate sinner; and the last wanderer from the path of virtue shall be brought home to his Father's house, amid the acclamations and rejoicings of the whole intelligent Universe.

# THE TRIALS

OF A

# CHURCH AND PASTOR,

IN

**Attempting to Maintain Gospel Discipline, under Consociational Interference,**

BY


## REV. LEVI NELSON,

PASTOR OF THE FIRST CHURCH, IN LISBON, CT.


---


NEW-LONDON:
STARR & FARNHAM, BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS.
1854.

# TRIALS OF A CHURCH AND PASTOR.

It appears by the records of what is now the First Church in Lisbon, that its first members adopted the Cambridge Platform. Also, according to the history of New London County, the ministers and churches did not adopt the Saybrook Platform, so far as to admit Consociations. But in the year 1814, most of the ministers and churches in the county formed a constitution for a Consociation, according to which they have chosen to manage their ecclesiastical polity since. The following is the only case in which the Churches have put discipline out of their own hands, in the Constitution of the Consociation :

" If any individual member of any church in this connection shall be aggrieved by censures which he may have received from said church, the door is open for him to state his grievance to the Moderator, or to the person acting in his stead, whose duty it shall be (if seriously and deliberately requested, and he cannot satisfy the aggrieved person without) to issue letters to call the Consociation together, to examine into the proceedings of the church, and to approve them, or to censure them, as they shall judge to be duty according to be the laws of Christ."

A case of this kind occured in relation to the first church in Lisbon. Thomas A. Clark, Esq., was excommunicated May 17, 1849. He appealed to the Consociation, which body met in Lisbon, Feb. 25 and

26 of 1851, and sustained the action of the church. According to the constitution of the Consociation, that body therefore could have no right to interfere again between the church and Mr. Clark, unless he should be restored to a regular standing in the church, and then be put under censure again. But, as will soon appear, the Consociation did interfere, as it respects the terms on which he should be restored, as though the church had no right to decide ultimately for themselves on this point. If they have not, then they have been out of order in claiming this right in relation to all the members who have been admitted since the constitution of the Consociation was adopted. But even if it were a case which might come under the cognizance of the Consociation in any form, it was out of order, and contrary to all ecclesiastical, or civil, or judicial rules, to introduce and attempt to sustain it, in the manner it was done. This I think will clearly appear.

Myself and delegate attended the annual meeting of the Consociation at Greenville, Oct. 14, 1851, as peaceable members of that body, and knew not but we had a right to all the privileges and immunities of a consociated church and pastor. I shall here transcribe much of a letter which I sent to a ministerial brother, a member of the Consociation, but who was not at the meeting. "Mr. Shipman, (the Rev. Thomas L. Shipman, pastor of the Jewett City church,) was allowed, very improperly as I believe, to attack the church under my care, and the delegate of the church, and myself as pastor were immediately put upon our defence, without any citation, and of course, contrary to all ecclesiastical or judicial rules.

We met the attack as well as we could, but with no proper preparation; particularly without the aid of such evidence as I have since collected, and which if I had had upon the spot, would have shown the astonishing rashness of the proceedings afterward. I did think, however, that it was sufficient to stop all proceedings against the church, that the moderator, after a while, declared the whole to be out of order, and no objection was made to his decision. I considered, that according to all the rules of order with which I have been acquainted, the Consociation were fairly bound to stop their course against us immediately. My feelings therefore were deeply wounded, that after this, members of the Consociation were allowed to make remarks in continuation of the subject, and evidently bearing against the church under my care.

"From previous signs, I had fears, as soon as I arrived at Greenville, that something painful to me was stirring up, which, together with what I actually experienced, so bore upon my feeble frame, that it was necessary to return home at night; and according to the mode of conveyance, my delegate must return likewise. I should have felt perfectly secure that nothing more would have been said upon the subject, had it not been for those remarks which were allowed to be made after the moderator's decision that the whole was out of order. On this account I did feel a little anxious; and accordingly spoke to a brother, that I hoped he would see that nothing more would be said upon the subject, or to this effect. He assured me, that no harm would be done, or something to this effect, and I do not know but he did what

he could to prevent what I might consider harm. But what was my astonishment to learn afterward, that in the absence of myself and delegate, the subject was brought up again, under the guise of an abstract question ; and an informal vote was passed bearing against the church ! I hesitate not to say, I believe that every member of the consociation must have known, that notwithstanding the abstract form, the very church aimed at was Lisbon church. And now, can I silently hear that there was no necessary reference to this church, simply because the consociation were pleased to put the question in an abstract form, and to make the decision informal, while the great theme was what this identical church did, or what it did not do ? Did I ever expect such an attempt at imposition from my ministerial brethren, whom I have always meant to treat openly and fairly—and to take such a course while myself and delegate were absent, and could not of course defend ourselves,—and absent when we considered the faith of the consociation pledged to protect us from mischief ? Was this fair and honorable treatment ? Who is safe, if a public body will prejudice a case under the pretext of an abstract question, in the absence of the party implicated, and their very judges giving them no opportunity to produce their evidence? And what is more galling still is, it has leaked out of the consociation, as I understand that Mr. Shipman, in my absence disclaimed what I said before the consociation, and on the strength of this disclaimer, they felt authorized to do as they did. So the consociation can consent to believe me a liar, on the authority of one man, and act accordingly ! Why should I be put so much below

Mr. Shipman, as a man of truth? The facts are these: On one of the last days of August, 1851, Mr. Shipman and Thomas A. Clark, Esq., called at my house, and proposed, in the presence of competent witnesses, to have Lisbon Church receive some general confession from Mr. Clark, and restore him. I replied that the trouble was, Mr. Clark never would confess that he was guilty. Many things were said, and among others, I said to Mr. Shipman, 'try Mr. Clark, and see if he will confess that he is guilty of anything.' I urged this point very earnestly, looking alternately toward Mr. Shipman and Mr. Clark. Mr. Clark said nothing for some time. At length he took the confession which Lisbon church had required him to sign, and said, 'If the church will strike out these two paragraphs,' pointing to the ones most offensive to him, he would sign it, but added, 'I am not guilty.' I immediately turned to Mr. Shipman and said, 'You now hear for yourself; you now hear Mr. Clark say he is not guilty." I then went on to say, I could not conceive what object the church could have to receive a confession from Mr. Clark, acknowledging he is guilty, when he says he is not guilty.

"Now Brother ——, I ask how you suppose a conscientious man would feel in my circumstances, as pastor of a church that was trying to do its duty toward an excommunicated member, to be treated as I was before the consociation? My statement was disclaimed by Mr. Shipman, who knew the facts as well as myself; but the consociation believing him instead of me, can insist that a church is bound to receive for consideration an indefinite number of confessions, even up to seventy times seven, without any excep-

tion, if they should only be presented in a respectful manner. And this a man might do if he were drunk every day. But it may be said the consociation did not know the evidence I had. True. But if that body had believed me, these 'out of order' proceedings would have been stopped, as they certainly ought to have been. I insist that the consociation indorsed Mr. Shipman's slander against me with their eyes open, and they are accountable for it. There was no need of disbelieving me, any more than there was of disbelieving him.

One of the members of the consociation has said, as I understand, that I hurt my cause before the consociation, for carrying out Mr. Clark's denial of guilt, in each part of the confession. I *had* no cause before the Consociation, except that which they very improperly, and contrary to all good rule dragged me into, as though I were a criminal pastor of a criminal church, without affording any time for preparing a defence. Supposing I had hurt my cause in such circumstances, —where does the guilt lie? Certainly on those who required the brick without the straw.

"It had been falsely represented to the Consociation, that Mr. Clark never had had an opportunity to present a confession of his own making to the Church. I tried to correct that statement. I told the Consociation that the Church *had* received what Mr. Clark called a written confession—that upon examination it appeared to be no confession; and that the peace of the church was greatly endangered by the experiment. I distinctly recollect, that I took special pains to have all the delegates as well as ministers understand me, when I said to this effect, that I had been

many years pastor of Lisbon church, and from what I knew, I dared not encourage the church to receive another confession from Mr. Clark for consideration, unless I had more evidence of penitence in him than I *had* had. But what I said seemed not to have the least effect upon the members of the Consociation.— They took no notice of it, but went on remarking as I have stated; and it seems the next morning, and in my absence, they acted upon the theory that a church is bound to receive any number of confessions up to seventy times seven of an excommunicated member, if he were only decent in presenting it. Now I cannot find a syllable in the bible to support such a theory; and it seems to be founded on an inference drawn from another subject. Because Christ requires us to forgive a penitent offender seventy times seven, if need be, the theory is, that if need be, we must wait seventy times seven to see if he repents. According to this scheme, there never would be an end to a given instance of discipline, and a church would of course lose all their dignity. And as I have stated in my circular, which I suppose you have received, nothing could be bound by a church. I now add, that nothing would be bound or loosed in earth or heaven, which would be in conformity with Mat. 18: 18. And with regard to what I told the Consociation, that I believed the peace of the church would be endangered by receiving Mr. Clark's confessions, I spoke from experience. Never did I see the church thrown into such confusion; and never did I see its existence so threatened, as when that piece of deception called a confession, was under consideration. Yet the Consociation did not pay the least respect to my judg-

ment on this subject, though I can say, and I believe without vanity, that from my situation, and that of my delegate, we did know far better than all the rest of the Consociation *could* about our internal concerns, as to what course it would be safe, and what course it would be dangerous to pursue; and I seriously believe the Consociation had no right to thrust in their theory against my judgment, as though they had no concern for the peace and safety of the church under my pastoral care, although I tried hard to make them feel the great delicacy of our situation. From that hour, I have considered the Consociation to be a dangerous body to the liberty of the churches. I solemnly believe, that their attempt to crowd another of Mr. Clark's confessions upon Lisbon Church, in the circumstances I have stated, was an infringement of our congregational rights, guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States—that our religious liberty was actually attacked, and in a vital part.

"There was another very painful consideration connected with this strange course of the Consociation. That body knew by their meeting at Lisbon in February, 1851, that I and the church under my care had had a hard case of discipline—a case, however, in which they sustained the church. But I think it must have been six weeks before the meeting of the Consociation at Greenville, that Mr. Shipman signified to me, that the church in Jewett City intended to receive Mr. Clark into full communion. I tried in vain to convince him of the great impropriety of such a measure. I very shortly notified a member of the Consociation of the plan, who seemed to feel as I did on the subject; and as there would be a ministers'

meeting, between that interview and the meeting of the Consociation, I had no doubt that the ministers would all know by the time of their meeting in Consociation, what the plan of Jewett City church and pastor was. But even if the ministers had not heard of this strange plan when at Greenville, they certainly did know that Lisbon church and pastor had had a very hard time. And if there ever was a time when ministers and churches need to be sustained by one another, if there ever was a time, when ordination pledges of ministers and churches come into use, it is when they pass through such trials as the Consociation well knew Lisbon church and pastor had experienced. Indeed, when I attempted in vain to persuade Mr. Shipman that the church under his care ought not to do as he threatened, I looked wishfully forward to the meeting of the Consociation, as the time when the ministers in their individual capacity at least would use their influence, to stop, if possible, so mad a project. But what were my disappointment and mortification to find that they *actually threw their influence to sustain Mr. Clark, and Mr. Shipman his advocate, to the disgrace of Lisbon church and pastor!* I did not know how silently to bear all this.—Neither myself or church ought to have been so treated. I have felt ever since as though my brotherly feelings, my character as a man of truth and veracity, and my religious liberty were trifled with. I have often asked myself, that if I cannot receive some satisfaction for such cruel treatment, how I should feel to hear those who have contributed to my sorrows, give the Right Hand of Fellowship at an ordination or installation, when the language will probably be of this

sort: '*We tender to you this right hand as a pledge that we will sustain you in all the ways we can, amidst the trials, which, as a gospel minister, you must expect,*' &c.

"I recollect but one circumstance on that day of trial, which has alleviated my grief. My delegate heard some one, a stranger to him, say at Mr. Bush's 'Why do the Consociation wish to plague that old man so?' Precious stranger! He had the milk of human kindness in him, at the most unfeeling meeting I ever had any connection with.

"Some think the difficulty between the Consociation and myself, is owing wholly to a misunderstanding. If so, it must I believe, be that misunderstanding which always exists between arbitrary assumptions and human liberty.

"With respect to the meeting of the Consociation at Lebanon last October, if a large proportion of ministers were for some action in relation to Jewett City church and pastor, I do not understand why that body should decide not to give advice on the subject, when the Moderator said it would be proper. How differently they acted at Greenville the year before. Then they were willing to do much more than to give Mr. Shipman advice, according to his question on the docket. His question was to this effect: what his duty was in relation to an excommunicated member of Lisbon church? This was a plain question, and Dr. Edwards answered it in these words, as nearly as I can recollect: 'Mr. Shipman might go home, attend to his own concerns, and let an excommunicated man alone.' But this only proper answer was far from satisfying Mr. Shipman. His object was

in an irrelevant and disguised manner to scandalize Lisbon church, and put it on trial, and obtain an informal judgment against it; and the Consociation sustained him in all this, under the cover of an abstract question! I doubt whether you will find in any other case such strange proceedings of ecclesiastical bodies in this country, or in any other where freedom exists.

"With regard to the objection of the Consociation at Lebanon last October, against giving Lisbon church advice, I understand the plea was, the fear of prejudging the cause. Mr! The Consociation had no fears about prejudging the cause at Greenville the year before, when Lisbon church and pastor were so unceremoniously attacked. No. But to have Jewett City church and pastor touched, *that alters the case.* If they were so afraid of prejudging the cause by giving advice, why did they not call in the aid of an abstract question to help them out, as they did the year before? That answered all the purpose then. It could be an abstract question and a practical one, and a practical question and an abstract one, as quick as thought. When I contrast the fearless, cold-blooded, determined proceedings of the Consociation at Greenville, when Lisbon church and pastor were hauled up before that body in an 'out of order' manner, to be judged as transgressors, with the great sensitiveness and backwardness which I understand were manifested when Jewett City church and pastor might be merely the subject for advice, by leave of the moderator. I am amazed at such an appearance of partiality and favoritism. Will such things prosper?

"I joined the Association of New-London County, if I mistake not, in the year 1806. It was my intention then, and has ever been since, to be a kind and peaceable member, rejoicing at the prosperity and success of my ministerial brethren, and minding my own business. I scarcely ever had even any little bickerings with any of them, till within two years. If I know any thing of myself, I know I never courted or desired more than common respect from any one; and this I have ever had, and sometimes more than I have desired, till October 14, 1851, except from one person, and that exception was not made certain to me till about two months before. But that disastrous day at Greenville, of the above date, commenced a new experience in my old age, and such an experience as I had never anticipated. Many have since been my weeping seasons; and scarcely a day or night has passed, when I have not felt keenly on the strange, unheard of treatment, which I have received from many ministers of the New-London County Consociation. I early notified them that their conduct had deeply wounded my feelings. I have followed up that notice with circulars and letters to individuals, till I am convinced there is no use in proceeding any further in such ways. If I ever had a forgiving spirit towards those who I think have injured me, I have it now; and I pray God I may always feel the law of kindness towards them, and be willing to enjoy again old friendship, if it can be obtained consistently with a proper degree of self-respect. But as I have found nothing like regret at their treatment toward me these eighteen months; and as this length of time has taught me that I can live in this

isolated state, I grow more and more indifferent on the subject, and can say, do as you like, getlemen.

"I hope it will be understood, that when difficulties assume an appearance as obstinate as those I complain of, communications should be in writing, rather than in conversation. Not many weeks since, a member of the Consociation called upon me, who had long known my feelings by a letter I addressed to him.—He seemed very friendly, till I was obliged to answer a question he put to me, in accordance with the position which he knew I had taken. He then became angry, said the Consociation had done *exactly right*, and soon went away in haste, saying repeatedly, that he never should call upon me again.

"When helpers fail, and foes invade,
God is our all-sufficient aid."

"Notwithstanding the great length of this letter, I want to add still more; for my heart is full. I do not know how much you sympathize with me in my peculiar situation. I hear it suggested that father Nelson is an old man—that he would not do so and so twenty years ago. This is the old insinuation, kept up from the time of Mr. Clark's trial. His dupes circulated in Lisbon and out of it, that I was an old, broken-down, superannuated man—had lost my mind, and the like, and was an object of pity. This was four years ago. Now it seems these stories have crawled into the Consociation; and as I am so much older, I suppose I must be a fool by this time.

"But as foolish as I am, I will state that when the Consociation met in Lisbon, February, 1851, they found 'one specification against Mr. Clark, which

they thought the church had not proved, because they said there was but one witness, and that the bible and our courts of justice require *two* witnesses.' But when I declared to the Consociation what I have offered to prove on these sheets, that Mr. Clark would not own that he was guilty, it seems the Consociation did not believe me; and as Mr. Shipman the next day, in my absence, denied it, they acted according to his testimony against me. Here, then, the Consociation find *one* witness sufficient to clear Mr. Clark of what I declared against him, and make me a liar beside. O, consistency! This witness is the Rev. Thomas L. Shipman.

"After such an appearance of partiality, I read with deep interest 1 Tim. 5; 21.

"Was all this misunderstanding, as some pretend? If so, who misunderstood? what was misunderstood? and how was it misunderstood? No one has been kind enough to answer these questions, though it is nearly two years since I first stated my grievances to the Consociation; and though I have heard of its being asserted by more than one, that all is owing to misunderstanding.

"If it be right for ministers of Jesus Christ to treat each other as the Consociation have treated me, I confess I have lost my reckoning on the voyage of life. And notwithstanding all my efforts to convince them that they have very deeply wounded my feelings by stating facts, which I do not believe they will ever deny, they seem to act as it was said in the British Parliament, concerning the treatment which the Americans received of their mother country, that their complaints were viewed only as *the capricious bawlings of*

*a child, that did not know when it was pleased.* It would be a foolish vanity in me to pretend that I ever knew a great deal, yet I have thought I knew something. But it has seemed to me that the Consociation in their meeting at Greenville, acted on the principle that I did not know anything, and that they have been carrying out this belief of me ever since."

I shall now quote largely from a letter written to a layman, dated December, 1852:

"DEAR SIR:—Since I have undertaken to give you some account of my trying circumstances in relation to the New-London County Consociation, I take the liberty to write to you again, though what I shall now state may seem more like romance than sober truth. Soon after I returned from Greenville, I came to a determination that it was my duty to call a Church Meeting to confer upon our peculiar situation, &c. It was evident to me that our congregational rights were grossly infringed upon, though I did not yet know, that after I and my delegate had left the meeting of the Consociation, that body adopted a course far more offensive than when we were present. Or, perhaps it is more proper to say, that they carried out what seemed to be their determination before we left them. And what will you think, sir, if I tell you, that on the same day of the appointed Church Meeting, a member of the Consociation was determined to make us believe that the church must receive for consideration, another confession from Mr. Clark, under those peculiar circumstances which I related in my other letter. *I knew* the course to be wrong, and contrary to my rights as pastor of a Congregational church—that the Consociation had acted against all

proper rules—'out of order,' according to the decision of the moderator, and their authority of course was just nothing. Yet the church, out of deference to the wishes of the Consociation, agreed to receive another confession from Mr. Clark, and so they turned their attention to a subject very different from that which I had contemplated when I called the meeting." Now the famous abstract question has become a practical one. *Just now*, it was nothing but a harmless abstract question, which the Consociation discussed, and merely decided upon it by an informal vote, without any application. *Now it means Lisbon Church*, and they were notified that they would not be in a 'right position,' till they received Mr. Clark's confession for consideration. Here, then, this act of the Consociation becomes binding authority upon the churches; an act which sprung into existence in the very improper manner I have described. "Could you have believed, sir, that the time would ever come, in the State of Connecticut and county of New-London, when the rights of a pastor would be so completely taken out of his own hands, and this, too, on the assumption that he did not know anything, or that he was, at any rate, to be set down as a mere cipher?

"You have been informed of the result. The church declared unanimously, that the confession was insufficient. This they did without any influence from me, for I did not deem it my duty to see or hear a confession crowded upon the church in such a manner, and I do not know the contents of it to this day. I was, however, quite certain before the church saw it, that it would not satisfy them. I thought I knew Mr. Clark as well as the Consociation did; (I think

so now,) and I have ever been sure, that Newent church mean something by discipline.

"But, as strange as it may seem, it has become a question, who drew that confession. Mr. Clark declared in open church meeting, the day before the meeting of the Consociation at Greenville, that it was all his dictation, even to every word—that he had had no help in forming it, or to this effect. On the other hand, the Rev. Thomas L. Shipman, as is understood, stated to the Consociation the next day, or the next but one, that if the confession was not right, he was the one to be blamed, for he drafted it himself. Now, as they both deemed it important to declare publicly who drew up the confession, we think it as important for us to know, as for them to undertake to tell. And as there is a falsehood between them, we know no better who wrote the confession than though they had said nothing about it. The Consociation, therefore, are responsible, for they had no right to interfere in the concern. It is demanded of them to inform us who wrote that confession, which they were determined Lisbon church should receive. We want the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. We want no lie about it. It is bad enough to be driven at such a rate to receive a confession of a known origin. We want no monster—a creature of two fathers, each of them claiming it exclusively as his own child. I was strongly solicited to get entangled with this confession, this creature of double parentage, some time before the meeting of the Consociation at Greenville. But I was confident there was mischief about it, and I bless Him who has ever been faithful to me, that neither Thomas A. Clark, nor

Thomas L. Shipman with the Consociation combined, could befool me on the subject. Please, sir, to look at it. After much labor with a delinquent, who was cut off from the church, which act was sustained by the Consociation, he and his advocate bring forward a confession, in very suspicious circumstances, (he declaring all the while that he is not guilty,) and very strange methods are taken to make the church receive it, and lo! it brings with it a palpable, public falsehood!" Is here the penitence a church is to look for after a course of discipline? Many in this fallen world have exposed their conduct, by doing too much to conceal it. "I insist, that from my situation, I was far better acquainted with the case than the Consociation could be, and this fact they ought to have known. I tried hard to make them understand it in the meeting at Greenville. But all in vain. The church, I have no doubt, did righteously reject the confession. But Mr. Shipman, as pastor of Jewett City church, has received Mr. Clark into it without any confession, and the floodgates are thrown open to sweep away the order and discipline, the peace and fellowship of ministers and churches in this region. Here we are, and it appears to me that a more reckless and sure course to bring us here, could not have been devised.

"It is more than a year since the things I complain of have transpired, and no apology, or expression of regret has come to my knowledge, from any of the actors against me, and the church under my care." The same is true now, June 1853. "Well, if the ministers of New-London County Consociation love their Consociational dignity better than my friendship and confidence, and better than what I have always thought

was implied in the right hand of fellowship, which they give in ordinations and installations, I cannot help it. *But let it be remembered*, that neither myself nor church are responsible for the difficulties which are growing up among us, and which may yet rend us in pieces."

I do not mean to intimate, however, that I am free from imperfections, even in defending a righteous cause. These follow me in whatever I do. Yet I think I can say it has been my aim to *think* right, to *feel* right, to *speak* right, and to *act* right, in my very trying situation, and that this has been my daily prayer, not always unattended with fasting.

When a member of the Consociation informed me of what they did in the absence of myself and delegate, he saw it troubled me, and in order to soothe my feelings, as I thought, he assured me, that before the ministers parted, they spoke of the very great respect they had for me and no minister in the Consociation they venerated more, or so much as they did father Nelson, or to this effect. But what could have induced the ministers in these circumstances, to extol me to the skies? I must believe it was owing to a sense they had of the injury they had done to me, and to the church under my care, and to nothing else. Some of them knew before I returned home the previous evening, that my feelings had been very deeply wounded. And they must have known, that what was done the next morning, was far more trying to my sensibility, than what was done the day before, if they acted on the principle that I could have any sensibility. Here, then, is a highly important disclosure. They had worried me in my presence, and injured me

in my absence, till conscience began to whisper in their ears; and then they undertook to make atonement for what they had done, by praising me. So it looks to me.

Before the Consociation undertake to treat others of their members in their absence, as they have treated me and Lisbon church, I hope they will read what the honorable Mr. Clayton said in his speech before the Senate of the United States, on the 8th of March, 1853, *concerning attacking the absent.*

In order to show how hard I have tried to make the Consociation do me justice for their cruel treatment of me and Lisbon church, I will state, that within about two months from the time of their meeting at Greenville, I sent each Consociated pastor who was present, (twelve beside myself as nearly as I can recollect,) a copy of a written circular, containing, according to the drafted copy, more that two sheets of quarto letter paper, each. (Some of the copies might be more condensed.) I here make some extracts from that circular.

"I was present when the constitution of the Consociation of New London County was formed in 1814. Then the constitution admitted mutual councils, whenever the parties should desire them. But to my deep regret, the constitution has been so altered as to prevent mutual councils; and accordingly the essential part of *practical* Congregationalism has been excluded. I have feared ever since this alteration, that the independence of the churches was in danger."

"In my defence on my trial, (and that of the church under my care,) the question came up re-

specting the right of a person under censure to present his confession to the church for consideration. The tenor of my argument was, as nearly as I can recollect, that *circumstances* must govern; and as Lisbon church had received one pretended confession from Mr. Clark, which, upon examination, was indeed no confession, and as the peace of the church was dangerously encroached upon by this course, I plainly told the Consociation, that I dared not encourage the church under my care to receive another confession from him. As the church had evidence of the dangerous effects of his confession, it makes no difference whether it was his first or his hundredth confession, or whether it was before or after he was excommunicated, or whether it was before or after his trial by the Consociation."

"I will here state some of the conversation which occurred at my house last February, after the meeting of the Consociation closed. My dear departed wife took a deep interest in our religious state. She asked Dr. McEwen, (who was moderator) whether the Consociation would give Mr. Clark a confession to sign, or words to that effect. Dr. McEwen replied nearly in these words: 'No. The Consociation have nothing to do with the subject. This business belongs to the church.'. I then add in my circular, 'this has been my opinion from my youth, and I did not know till lately that there was any other opinion.' Look at Mat. 18: 17. 'But if he neglect to hear *the church* let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.' *But if he neglect to hear the church.* The very form of expression shows the ecclesiastical authority which the church has over the guilty person. He is

to hear the church. The church, and not he, is the dictator. The church is to act according to its judgment. But the whole course is reversed, if the church must wait to receive an indefinite number of confessions. Then of what use are the Savior's words in the very next verse to the one already quoted?—'Whatsover ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' All, as far as I know, agree that this passage refers to church discipline. Now on the principle I am opposing, as the case may be, the church can never bind anything. The delinquent can keep the church waiting upon him to receive confessions as long as he lives. Nothing can be settled—nothing can be bound. This explanation seems more clear still, if we consider the only passage I ever heard quoted to prove that a church must receive all the confessions which the delinquent may wish to offer. We are pointed to the 22d verse of Mat. 18. Peter had asked Christ if he must forgive a brother seven times? 'Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee until seven times; but until seventy times seven.' Can any one seriously believe that this text is to the purpose? This passage is on the subject of forgiveness. What has this to do with the number of times we must wait upon a person to ascertain whether he repents? But admitting for argument sake it is relevant to the case; then as the case may be, we must wait to have the delinquent bring seventy times seven confessions. Seventy times seven are if I mistake not 490. Divide 490 by 12, the number of months in a year, and the quotient is over 40. Then, as the case may be, the church must be haunt-

ed once a month for 40 years, with an excommunicated person.

"How long is the church to wait for Mr. Clark to end in another confession for their consideration? And after he shall have sent in the third, how long will the Consociation wait for the church to consider it, before they call the church to an account, at the beck of Mr. Clark? It is important that we should know particulars, for the church have entered upon a course of action which Mr. Clark may keep up as long as he lives, according to the doctrine of the Consociation. It seems that excommunicated people are more highly favored now, than in the time of the apostles. When Paul excommunicated Hymeneus and Alexander, he delivered them unto Satan." (He directed the Corinthians also to do the same to the incestuous person.) "But according to this modern doctrine, a church must be so obsequious to the whims of an excommunicated person, that its members, and not he, are the ones delivered unto."

I have received no reply to the circular from which these extracts are taken.

After several months I addressed another circular, (not as long as the first,) to four prominent ministers belonging to the Consociation, from which I will make some extracts:

*Lisbon, August*, 1852.

Rev. ———:

Dear sir.—It is more than ten months since I have been smarting under the *very cruel* treatment, which I, and the church under my pastoral care, have received from the Consociation of New-London County; and something has recently leaked out from one of

the members of that body, which is worse than what I heard before."

"If the Consociation do not adopt measures, at their next annual meeting, which shall effectually and entirely remove all the reproach they have cast upon me and the church under my care, it is my intention, should the Lord give me strength, to address the public on the subject. In that address I shall not fail to present such oral and documentary evidence, as will substantiate my statement before the Consociation last October, at Greenville, while that body acted as though they did not believe me; and they have left me ever since, under the stigma of uttering a public falsehood." I did think that the justice of my cause, old friendship and long and peaceable membership, would have led those to whom the circular was sent, to take some notice of it; but I have not heard a word! So it seems that Consociational authority, arbitrary power, and domineering over brethren, must live!

I have already made a concise statement of the oral testimony, to which I referred in this circular. I have substantial witnesses; witnesses, who I believe will not shrink from declaring what they saw and heard. The documentary evidence referred to, is taken from the records of Lisbon church, and is in the following words: "Objections being made by Mr. Clark to the aforesaid form of confession; he asked for time to consider upon it. Voted to adjourn to Thursday, the 3d day of May next, at the Conference House, 2 o'clock P. M. Reuben Bishop, *Clerk pro tem.*

"*May* 3.—Met according to adjournment. Prayer was offered by the moderator. The doings of the

previous meeting being read, it was voted to defer the consideration of the confession prescribed for Mr. Clark by the church, *in order to hear one prepared by himself.* After some discussion, the church refused to accept it, and Mr. Clark refusing to sign the one prescribed to him by the church, another unavailing effort for a form was made, to unite his views with those of the church. It being a time of deep concern, prayer was offered to God for direction. After some desultory conversation, the meeting adjourned without day.

REUBEN BISHOP, *Clerk pro tem.*"

Rev. Abel McEwen, D. D., was moderator of the church when Mr. Clark was excommunicated. He drew the confession above referred to, and if I am not mistaken, it was done by Mr. Clark's request. It was, I thought, a mild confession. And after it was rejected, the church, as is stated, made another effort with Mr. Clark; and I believe that they would almost have leaped for joy, if they had seen any signs of repentance in him. But they had discernment enough to perceive, as they thought, that he felt just as he always maintained that he was, NOT GUILTY. They could see not the least evidence that he had any sense of having done wrong for what the church excommunicated him, and for what the Consociation sustained the church.

But notwithstanding the proceedings of the church of which the above record was made, were always accessible to any who showed the least desire to know what was going on, it seems that members of the Consociation were made to believe that Lisbon church never had given Mr. Clark an opportunity to present any confession for their consideration of his own ma-

king. Now, as I have understood, this story was what induced the Consociation to consent to have Lisbon church and pastor brought up before them in so unceremonious and irregular a manner.

It is a proper question, how could such a naked falsehood make so much mischief? My belief is, that so painful results would have had no existence, if Mr. Clark's word had not been infallible to Mr. Shipman; and if Mr. Shipman's words had not been infallible to the Consociation, and if my words had been viewed as possessing any honest meaning.

## "MUTUAL EXPLANATIONS."

I have been invited to meet the Consociation, that there may be *mutual explanations*, and so all difficulties be settled. If a man, while passing along peaceably, minding his own business, and feeling all the good nature, good will and kindness he ever possessed, should be surrounded, thrown down and trampled upon, I think he would not care to hear about *mutual* explanations for a settlement.

What is to become of the divine institution of church discipline, if things go on at the rate I have attempted to describe? God has established this holy institution for the purposes of reclaiming offenders, and keeping the churches pure. If the ministers of Christ ever stand in need of combined effort, it is to sustain each other, and strengthen each other's hands, when they have occasion to enter upon the delicate and unpopular duties so necessary to accomplish these important objects in the kingdom of Christ. But I have never met with anything in my life before, which, in point of discouragement on this subject can

be compared with what I have experienced within these two years. Must a pastor of a church pass an ordeal as tremendous as running the gauntlet, for endeavoring to assist those under his care to perform the plain duties of religion? Must he see those who he thought were bound by their ordination and installation vows to sustain him, listening to the misrepresentations of meddlers, throwing their sympathies and influence against him, and in favor of such busy bodies, disbelieving his word, thwarting his plans, disappointing, mortifying and harrassing him with their unscriptural theories, their abstract questions, and their gross prejudgment of a cause which he knows they do not understand, but from which he tries in vain to make them desist? Is there no way to secure him and the church under his care from attacks upon them when they are absent—when even cowards are very brave?

What a source of gratification the knowledge of such manoeuvres affords that part of the community who love to see such "fun go on!" And especially, what a continual festival to the excommunicated themselves, and to their dupes!

In all the strange, unheard-of treatment which Lisbon church and pastor have received from the Consociation, it does not appear, as I recollect, that that body have said a word to maintain the necessity that a person under censure should come back by way of repentance. Their notions of discipline remind one of the authority which some parents are said to assume over their children. They correct them, and then try to make up with them the easiest way they can. To do this, the Consociation threw

their sympathies against Lisbon church and pastor, in a public meeting, though they did not know the case; the effect of which was, whether they designed it or not, to uphold the man in impenitence, whose excommunication they had sanctioned themselves.

It is impossible to communicate the depth of sorrow I have felt at what the Consociation have done, unless I state the views I have learned in the word of God, concerning the manner in which excommunicated persons ought to be treated. It is well known that the Savior in the 18th chapter of Matthew, finishes the process of church discipline, in these words: "But if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." Here, as in all the divine Savior's illustrations, he was exceedingly plain and forcible. Now the disciples knew very well how they and the other Jews treated the heathen and publicans. The question was not, how *Christ* treated publicans, who was himself in some respects an exception to the rule. But the question before the minds of the disciples was, "How do we, and the rest of the Jews treat the heathen and publicans?" And the scriptures are explicit on this point. Acts 10: 28. "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation." John 4: 9.— "Then saith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." The Samaritans were of another nation, and this was the reason why it was unlawful for Jews to keep company with them, or to come unto them. Has not the Savior then

plainly taught the churches to withhold that intercourse from those who will not hear them, which is common among themselves ?

But further. The direction which the apostle gave the Corinthians (1 Cor. 5) fully confirms the view we have taken of the direction of Christ. Says Paul, "I wrote unto you in an epistle, not to keep company with fornicators : yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolators : for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, *if any man that is called a brother* be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner : with such an one, *no not to eat.*" The apostle was instructing the church at Corinth how to deal with the professed brother, who had fallen into the sin of having "his father's wife." In the last verse of the chapter, he directed, "Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." He had already said, "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." Here is excommunication; and nothing can be plainer than that the church was directed to treat him who was called a brother but had fallen into sin, differently from their treatment of other sinners ? "With such an one, no not to eat." The passages I have quoted show how these words are to be understood. Withhold from such a person the common tokens of familiarity and friendship, just as the Jews were accustomed to

withhold them from other nations and from publicans. Eating together by invitation has always been considered such a token; and this is undoubtedly the manner of eating intended. No one supposes that the apostle intended, by eating in this case, that the Corinthians should deny the acts of hospitality and mercy to an excommunicated person.

By the explanation of scripture here given, I think the following passage is made plain. 2 Thess. 3: 6. "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that *ye withdraw yourselves* from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us." The withdrawing here means not only the act of excommunication, but what the disciples must have understood the Savior to mean by, "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." I think there can be no mistake here, for in the fourteenth verse of this same chapter, the reason is given why churches should thus withdraw from unworthy members. "And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him *that he may be ashamed.*" It was far from the intention of the apostle to encourage the Thessalonians to indulge any ill will toward those whom they might put under censure. Accordingly it is said in the next verse, "Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." The meaning I think must be, "Treat the fallen brother kindly, when you happen to fall in his way, and endeavor to do him good. But use no familiarity with him, as though you meant to keep company with him. And adopt this course with him, *that he may be ashamed.*" I know of no direction in the

Bible plainer than this. And it appears to be adapted to answer the end intended, which is, *reformation.* It has been a common sentiment in the world, that the passion of shame is very useful to bring the wicked to serious consideration. Accordingly the Psalmist prays, Psalm 83 : 16, "Fill their faces with shame, that they may seek thy name, O Lord." Here as well as in the passage just noticed, shame seems to be brought to view by the spirit of divine inspiration *as a means of reformation.* The Psalmist prays at least seven other times, that the wicked, or his enemies, might be put to shame, or be ashamed, when we have reason to believe his object was the same as that which he expressed in the verse already quoted; viz : their reformation,—that they may seek the name of the Lord.

I have now stated as briefly as I could, what I have long thought to be the scriptural direction for treating those under the censure of a church ; and if it be not a plain direction, I know not where to find one in the Bible. I had thought that there was no other opinion among orthodox ministers. This grand scriptural reason, and because each church is better situated to know how their own delinquents ought to be dealt with than others can know, lead me to think, that there is a great impropriety in interfering with church discipline without the most obvious reasons. In the course of my life, I have been strongly solicited to do it, and so help embarrass those who thought they were engaged in their own proper business under the divine direction. But I have utterly refused; and I have reason to be thankful at the prospect that such sins will not lie at my door.

The great plea for interfering with church discipline is the suspicion that churches may act with wrong motives, be partial, cruel, &c. All this is possible, but I had far rather risk a church here, than any other public body on earth; for churches are the only standing judicatories mentioned in the New Testament. They are of divine appointment; and those who undertake to break in upon their order, must, to say the least, be very sure of clean hands themselves. It is possible that *they*, also may be partial, "out of order," and as hard-hearted toward individual ministers and churches as these can be toward their own delinquents. And if they should interfere, and throw their sympathies on the side of delinquents, and undertake to sustain them, how can churches enforce the divine direction, so to neglect those under their censure, as is best calculated to make them ashamed of their conduct? This course is the scriptural resort, and it appears to be the *last* resort, so far as means are concerned, to bring the fallen to repentance. According to the best light which I can obtain from the word of God, I believe, therefore, it is positively dangerous to the souls of such as are under church censure, for others to step in and take their part, especially if they are not thoroughly acquainted with all the facts in the case. Instead of leaving the delinquent with God's appointed means, that he may have the best opportunity to reflect upon what he has done, humble himself before God, and repent, he is taken up and sustained in his sins, by *pretended* friends, and encouraged to carry out his opposition to the church, and emboldened to maintain *that he is not guilty.* I must believe that such a course is, to employ the direct means

to harden the heart of an unhumbled delinquent, and confirm him in impenitence. That it is "strengthening the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way." Those who try so hard to take such responsibilities upon themselves may have them; and they will have them, there is no mistake. May the Lord forever keep me from such responsibilities.

The views I have now stated concerning church discipline, I have adopted from my youth. It is easy to perceive, therefore, that I am painfully frustrated in my plans and attempts to preserve the church under my pastoral care from the inroads of disorder and corruption, and to be faithful to one who has been scripturally put under censure.

I will now give a more summary statement of my grievances toward the Consociation of New-London County.

I. Because at their annual meeting in Greenville, Oct. 14, 1851, they suffered the Rev. Thomas L. Shipman to attack and attempt to criminate, the first church in Lisbon, as long as he pleased, while there was nothing on the docket to warrant such an attack.

II. Because the subject, even if it had been properly introduced, was one with which the Consociation had nothing to do, according to the Constitution under which they professed to act. But

III. Though the case had been one which would have been cognizable by the Consociation, if proper notice had been given to Lisbon church, that body had no right to entertain it a moment, because said Lisbon church had not been cited. Because

IV. Though after a while, the moderator declared

the whole proceeding to be "out of order," yet members of the Consociation were allowed, while myself and delegate were present, and to our great mortification, to state opinions which bore against Lisbon church, as though it had had a fair trial, and members were expressing their minds for adjudication against it.

V. Because the Consociation suffered to be brought up the next day, though in an abstract form, and in the absence of myself and delegate, the very same subject which the moderator had declared the day before, to be out of order.

VI. Because the pretence that it was nothing but an abstract question, under such circumstance had much the appearance of a trick against Lisbon church. And what a member of the Consociation tried to make Lisbon Church do afterwards, fully confirms my belief that said Lisbon church was specially aimed at by the Consociation.

VII. Because the Consociation persevered in this covert manner, and passed an informal vote, without sufficient testimony, which fact they would have known, had they placed confidence in what I told them the day before, and so they evidently prejudged the case, which was itself out of order, and bearing against Lisbon church, that had never been cited.

VIII. Because, according to the best information I can obtain, and I have tried to come at the facts, Mr. Shipman was allowed in my absence to contradict the statement I made the day before, and the Consociation believed him, and acted accordingly. Thus implicitly accusing me of lying to the Consociation in their public meeting, though they were under no necessity

of taking any action on the subject, and of course they were under no necessity of deciding whose statement was true or false—Mr. Shipman's or mine. I protest against such an attempt to injure my character as a man of truth. There is a wantonness of this abuse of me in my absence, which I know not how to describe.

IX. Because by such management in the Consociation, Lisbon church and myself lost that protection from that body, which universal usage extends to all orderly members of public bodies.

X. Because the Consociation judged over Lisbon church concerning their internal affairs, as though the church were not capable of deciding what would be for their peace. In other words, as though the church were not capable of managing their own proper business. I deem such an interference to be a violation of the vested rights of a Congregational church and pastor, which are guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States.

XI. Because by the zeal and perseverance of the Consociation at Greenville to implicate Lisbon church of wrong, in an "out of order" manner, and by their determination at Lebanon the year after, not to give Lisbon church advice in relation to Jewett City church, which the moderator, said would be in order, they seemed to show a remarkable partiality *against* Lisbon church, and *for* Jewett City church.

XII. Because the whole course, which the Consociation pursued at Greenville, in relation to Lisbon church and pastor, is calculated to discourage all attempts to maintain church discipline, and to encourage a most dangerous method of treating those under censure, who give no evidence of penitence.

*The story of my Grievances not yet finished.*

In the month of March, 1853, fourteen months after the person excommunicated from Lisbon church was admitted into the church at Jewett City ; and about five months after the delegate from Lisbon church, at the annual meeting of the Consociation in Lebanon, sought advice from that body in vain concerning Jewett City church and pastor, though the moderator as I understand, told the Consociation expressly that it was their duty to give Lisbon delegate advice ; and after I was convinced by repeated efforts in circulars and letters to individuals, that the Consociation would do nothing to relieve my feelings so deeply injured, I wrote another circular. In that I say, "It is with grief I feel constrained to inquire, why the Consociation of New London County have not called the Rev. Thomas L. Shipman to account for his disorderly conduct in receiving as Pastor into full communion, in Jewett City church, an excommunicated member from the first church in Lisbon without any confession on his part ? The Consociation very well know that such conduct is destructive of the peace of the churches, and of the divine institution of church discipline. They must know, also, that their refusal or neglect to perform this service neutralizes their own act in sustaining the action of Lisbon church, Feb. 26, 1851 ; that it *yields* their persevering efficiency as a church judicatory, and is calculated to embarrass and discourage those pastors and churches, that would maintain church discipline, according to the word of God. It also affords an opportunity to cavillers of all grades to comment on in-

consistencies both of pastors and churches, with that wisdom and boldness which ought to make every friend of truth and righteousness blush with conscious shame, as he sees the Consociation professing to sustain Lisbon church by *voice* and *vote*, and yet extending the right hand of fellowship to Jewett City church and pastor."

According to a reply to this circular which I have received, the Consociation would be willing to attend to the case if any would bring it forward. To me this sounds extraordinary. How easy it was for the Consociation at Greenville to find a way to take up a case when it was *against Lisbon church!* The difficulty there was to *stop* it, though a false case which was brought up in an "out of order" manner, the whole an unjust and cruel affair! No difficulty about bringing up such a case, and holding it up in a manner to outrage the feelings of old friendship, and present an innocent church and pastor as a target to be shot at. No difficulty in finding a way to continue this "out of order" case, and decide upon it in the absence of myself and delegate! But here are a pastor and church, taking into full fellowship an excommunicated member of a neighboring church of the same denomination—(a thing unheard of among Congregationalists, as far as I can learn,) breaking in upon old friendship, and setting an example absolutely destructive of gospel discipline, this church and pastor it seems, members of the Consociation, are exposed in the view of some to be called to an account, *if there are any to bring the case forward!* Ah! where there is a will there is a way.

When the the Consociation were called to Lisbon,

in February, 1851, to give Mr. Clark a re-hearing, his case was taken out of the hands of the church; and inasmuch as they sustained the church, they were certainly bound to see that the sentence which the church had passed, should be carried out. But instead of it, another church, as much under Consociational authority as Lisbon church, have received the excommunicated member into full communion, and thus nullified what the Consociation, as well as what Lisbon church have done. This, as might be supposed, has been peculiarly embarrassing to Lisbon church and pastor. They thought that the Consociation would certainly stand by them, as they had decided the case in their favor. But they have reason to believe, that the Consociation have acted more *against* them than *for* them from the fatal 14th of October, 1851. Some of the reasons of this belief have already been stated, and certainly they have no occasion to alter their opinion in view of the ministers' monthly meeting at Jewett City, August 9, 1853. If it was *lawful* for them to hold their meeting at Jewett City at that time, I cannot see that it was *expedient.* They could not suppose that in this unsettled and excited state of things, their presence would have *no* bearing on the troubles which the Jewett City pastor and those of his church occasioned, who admitted the excommunicated member into good standing among them. They had neglected a very important duty in relation to that church and pastor, and the excommunicated member can now meet them as in regular standing in the church and Consociation, a dear brother. Yes, the very man whose censure by Lisbon church they had sanctioned, is now with them in

fellowship, through the defiance of Jewett City church and pastor, against what the Consociation and Lisbon church had done. Could the Consociation expect that their meeting at Jewett City in such circumstances would be calculated to conciliate the feelings of Lisbon church and pastor, and others in the community who believe we have done our duty? Can they expect that this is the way to heal that wound in Zion, which has broken out with such violence, because a church and pastor have endeavored to mind their own business, and perform their duty toward God and man with a good conscience? The case has seemed so glaring that I have felt it to be an imperious, though a very painful duty, to address another short circular to the pastors who attended that meeting in Greenville, so often referred to. It is in these words: "Dear sir.—The ministers' meeting at Jewett City on the 9th inst., composed of so many Consociated ministers of New-London county, under present circumstances, when it is so obvious that the church and pastor of that place ought *long ago* to have been called to account, will, I believe, be viewed by many conscientious people on the one hand, and by many cavillers on the other, as smoothing over, and even indorsing the part which Jewett City church and pastor have acted, in receiving into full communion an excommunicated member of Lisbon church, without any confession from him.

"Such an example from the ministers of the Gospel tends to break down all church discipline, and consequently to ruin the churches, and bring our denomination into contempt."

Now I can but think the reader will believe the fore-

going circular was penned by one of a heavy heart; one who had always before taken satisfaction in meeting his ministerial brethren so near him, and could consider himself one with them; but now having nothing better to expect, than that they would, as opportunities might occur, carry out the same unsympathizing spirit toward a brother, which had been practiced for nearly two years. I will not *say* that their visit at Jewett City emboldened that church to send the excommunicate as a delegate to meet in council soon afterward, but so it was. He was sent, and acknowledged as a regular member of the council, and acted with them at an installation, within a short time after the ministers' meeting at Jewett City! Who can doubt that my mortification became now very great, or that a very dangerous blow was given to the divine institution of gospel discipline in this region? Unless the Consociation take a very different stand, it would be foolish, as well as vain, for a consociated church in this county to attempt anything further by way of discipline. Here is one of the plainest of all cases of discipline; one which the Consociation had sanctioned themselves, and unanimously, too, as has been understood. This very person was received into a church under their care, without a word of confession, and is now, to all intents and purposes, owned as a regular member of a consociated church! And all this is true, though Lisbon church has attempted to obtain relief from their unpleasant situation. A record of this attempt is in the following words:

"Friday, Sept. 2, 1853.—After sacramental lecture, the church, having been duly notified, adopted the following Resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That brothers Elisha P. Potter, (Dea.,) Joseph B. Hibbard and Elijah Rathbun, Jun., be a committee to file a complaint against Jewett City church and pastor, with the Moderator of the Consociation of New-London County, for receiving into full communion an excommunicated member of the first church in Lisbon, without any confession on his part." *This is an extract from the record of that meeting.*

It appears that the Consociation did nothing with this complaint, as it respected the pastor of Jewett City church, who officiated in "receiving into full communion an excommunicated member of the first church in Lisbon, without any confession on his part." Why was it so? The act of the church, however, was declared to be disorderly. But did the Consociation put the church in Jewett City under censure for their disorderly act? No. They simply say they would "express the hope that Jewett City church may come to view it in the same light, and take measures, if possible, for the sake of the peace of our churches, to restore good understanding and good fellowship between themselves and the church in Lisbon."

Here it may with propriety be asked what the Consociation expect Jewett City church can do, to make peace with Lisbon church, so long as they, the Consociation, virtually fellowship the excommunicated member themselves? Do they expect that Jewett City church will persuade Lisbon church to rescind their vote, which declared Mr. Clark's confession insufficient? And even if Lisbon church could be persuaded to do this, would the Consociation advise them to receive *any* confession from Mr. Clark, so long as

he declares that he is not guilty of those charges for which Lisbon church excommunicated him, and for which the Consociation sustained that church?

Much of the time since October, 1851, I have despaired of seeing anything in the Consociation like a disposition to relieve my mind in relation to what has given me so much trouble. Yet I have sometimes tried against hope to believe in hope. The following was sent in such a mental conflict:

"NOTICE.

To the moderator of the Consociation of New-London county, and those pastors of churches who were present and acted in the annual meeting of the Consociation at Greenville, Oct. 14, 1851.

"The subscriber would again remind them that they *very deeply* wounded his feelings at that meeting, by the course they pursued with himself and the church under his pastoral care, and here they have seemed willing to leave him ever since, though the moderator of the meeting declared their proceedings to be 'out of order' at the time. The subscriber can but hope that they will yet unitedly signify to him their regret for needlessly giving him so much and so long-continued trouble, while he is not conscious that either he or the church under his care had done anything to justify or excuse such treatment at their hands. But if they should feel otherwise disposed, he will consider himself at liberty, and justified, for publishing this notice at any time he pleases, after four months from this date. LEVI NELSON.

Lisbon, Oct. 20, 1853."

Extract of a letter to Rev. ———, dated Jan. 26, 1854.

"Dear Sir: After all that I, and the church under my pastoral charge had gone through to take care of a disorderly member, according to the laws of Christ; after that same person had been received into a Consociated church in regular standing without any confession on his part; and after he had even been owned by a council of Consociated ministers and churches as in regular standing, and permitted to sit and act with them in installing a minister of Jesus Christ, I did hope that my cup of mortification was full enough to satisfy even an enemy. But it seems that the Consociation at Lebanon, (Exeter society) last October, did nothing to reach Mr. Clark. They only declared the act of Jewett City church disorderly for receiving him without any confession on his part, and *hope* the church will do better. Is this Consociational discipline? I have thought it was a principle with all Consociational people, that a church stands in the same relation to a Consociation as an individual does to a church; and it is well known that according to the New Testament discipline, the delinquent must either repent, or be cut off. But the Consociation have done nothing to Jewett City church, though it has been declared to be disorderly. They hope the church in Jewett City will do better; that is all. They have then set this example to the churches. After the charges have been proved against a delinquent, the church may *hope* he will do better, and let him go. It really seems that the Consociation have made some progress since their meeting at Greenville in Oct. 1851. Then they thought that a delinquent

might tease a church, as the case might be, seventy times seven, with his confessions, probably as long as he would live. Now they have found out, that they can live on the *hope* that a delinquent will do better, without being required to retrace his steps in any form. If the Consociation had been disposed they could have reached Mr. Clark, through Jewett City church and sustained their own action in favor of Lisbon church, and I believe they were bound to do it. But as it is, Mr. Clark is a regular member of a Consociated church. He understands it, and as we hear *he is now triumphing over us :—that he says he is as good as any of them.* Now if the Consociation had let Lisbon church and pastor alone at Greenville, as I am very confident they ought to have done ; if they had not very improperly and most unkindly and in an "out of order" manner intermeddled with our concerns, we should not have come to this. I have within a few months obtained the opinion of a respectable lawyer who has been familiar with ecclesiastical proceedings, and who happened to know how Lisbon church and myself have been treated, and he said, without hesitation, and earnestly repeated it several times, *The Consociation have done wrong, very wrong.* He pointed out several particulars wherein they had done very wrong. I bless the Lord that I have heard such kind and encouraging words from so respectable a source ; for I have gone through with a scene of mortification and provocation enough to distract a man, ever since the Consociation permitted Mr. Shipman so unfairly to attack Lisbon church and myself in October, 1851. And to cap the climax, if there can be any end to it, the Consociation have taken

into their bosom an excommunicate from this church, and he is now, as I understand, triumphing over me. Have the Consociation forgotten that I am flesh and blood? Do they think that I have the nerves of a Leviathan? It does seem to me that they care no more for an elder brother, who has always meant to treat them well, than an ox cares for the worm he treads upon. What then have I done to merit such treatment from the hands of man? I hope they will all live to be old, who are not so already; and that none of them will have any to disturb the quiet of their old age, as they have disturbed mine. I very much mistake, if you would not be disquieted if your old brethren should treat you as my old brethren have treated me.

I remain, &c."

I think that no person acquainted with the facts will hesitate to believe, that our present condition is just what is to be expected, considering the extraordinary meeting of the Consociation at Greenville in October, 1851, when, either from listlessness, or from a combination against some of their own members, or for their zeal to introduce a theory about receiving confessions from such as are under censure, the Consociation seemed to withdraw even common protection from Lisbon church and pastor, at the very time if ever when they needed help; and they threw their sympathies and influence, whether by design or not, just where they could injure said church and pastor the most. The consequence is, extreme mortification to find our best exertions to maintain the holy institution of church discipline ruined, and ourselves made the butt of reproach. Yea, the Consociation take

the excommunicated man by the hand, as a dear brother, and sit in council with him, give him an opportunity, if so disposed, to triumph over us, and leave us to rue the day, when we placed confidence in them as an ecclesiastical judicatory. This they do in circumstances, which look as though they were determined to worry an old friend, till they shall have put out the last spark of expiring friendship in his breast. It is now March, 1854, and I have received no kind response—nothing but a "dignified silence" to my last effort to show them that *they had very deeply wounded my feelings!*

In making a statement of *our trials in attempting to maintain gospel discipline, under Consociational interference*, I feel it my duty to address a word to real Congregationalists.

Dear brethren, you believe that "each particular church hath authority from Christ to exercise government, and not only hath power, but ought to exercise church discipline, in relation to scandals and heresies that fall out among its own members; having power to receive and to reject them, according to the rules of God's word." Accordingly, you believe that each particular church is the only standing judicatory known in the New Testament. It may then with propriety be asked, of what use are Consociations, considered as assistants to churches in anything? I answer, they are of no benefit, which cannot be enjoyed without them, and with far less trouble than with them. Congregationalism allows of no authority over a church as a rule. All must be merely advisory, unless in any given case, where a mutual and advisory council is called, the parties agree to abide

the decison of the council. This they would have a right to do in the pending case only. Now the very notion of a Consociation seems to imply, that there may be such cases. Then let the parties agree to make them, if they please, after the mutual councils are called. Here, then, is all the authority which is consistent with Congregationalism ; all parties agreeing to have it so, in each case ; and in every case where there is not this entire agreement, the mutual council must be advisory only. There can therefore be no standing authority over churches, consistent with the first principles of Congregationalism. Thus, only let mutual councils decide cases, when it is the choice of all parties that they should, and the great pretended object of Consociations is secured, and all the paraphernalia and cumbersomeness of a distinct organization are spared.

Now, dear brethren, as you profess Congregational liberty, will you accept the advice of one who has had some experience, and not all of it the most pleasant? *Be not entangled with any yoke of bondage.* And remember, that the price of liberty, either civil or religious, IS PERPETUAL WATCHFULNESS.

Whatever course the Consociation may hereafter think proper to adopt in relation to the excommunicated person from Lisbon church whom they now visibly fellowship, it cannot be forgotton, that what they have done, and what they have neglected to do, have given infidelity a long opportunity to laugh, and all the haters of church discipline to say, "Ah, so we would have it." In the first circular I sent to the Consociation, within about two months after their meeting in Greenville, it is said, "I will be as unbe-

lieving as I can ; but I must say, that if that ecclesiastical body had made it a definite object to insult Lisbon church and myself, to trample upon our rights, and to burlesque all serious, scriptural church discipline, they would have adopted the same or a similar course." But it was then beyond my expectation, that within so short a period, there would be such a *living specimen!* It speaks volumes, and I trust it will be heard.

# REVIEW OF

# GLIDDON AND NOTT'S

## "TYPES OF MANKIND."

*Types of Mankind: or Ethnological Researches, based upon the Ancient Monuments, Paintings, Sculptures, and Crania of Races, and upon their Natural, Geographical, Philological, and Biblical History; illustrated by selections from the inedited papers of Samuel George Morton, M. D., (late President of the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia,) and by additional contributions from Prof. L. Agassiz, LL. D., W. Usher, M. D., and Prof. H. S. Patterson, M. D.* By J. C. Nott, M. D., Mobile, Alabama, and George R. Gliddon, formerly U. S. Consul at Cairo. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1854. pp. 738.

To read, with great and constantly increasing reluctance, a quarto of more than seven hundred pages, in which one may find nothing that he would care to remember, but much that he would gladly forget; such is the infliction which we have laid upon ourselves. To prevent mischief to those, who, not familiar with the signs of real learning, may be induced, even for a short time, to imagine that there is any thing like it in this farrago, we have forced ourselves to notice a publication which offers next to nothing to commend, much to censure, more to condemn.

In fact, we do not know that we have ever been much more disgusted with any thing than with this book. Nothing would induce us to touch it, but the fear that men may not understand its utter unsoundness, amidst its immeasurable pretension. Somebody must show that all this parade of Hebrew and Ethnology, Egyptianism and Negrology, is mere—*Gliddonism.* To think of such a man, "one who has been to a feast of learning and stolen away the scraps," picking up a little ethnography here, a little craniology there, some superficial Orientalism in wandering about the Levant, some Hebraism from reviews, second-hand books, and an occasional talk over a pipe with a muddy Rabbi, or a mug of beer with a half-infidel German, and with such artillery undertaking the overthrow of God's word!

The doctrine of this book is, that the races of mankind have not a common parentage or origin, but are distinct, original creations in different centres on the earth, and, it may be, at distant intervals of time. These races have each a fixed, indelible type. It never changes under the operation of any causes, physical or moral, through any period of time, however prolonged. A race may change their religion, their government, their country, their customs, their language; all else but their own indelible type.

On this assumed fact, is based, what the authors are pleased to denominate, the new science of ethnography. "The whole method of treating the subject is herein changed. To our point of view, most that has been written on human Natural History becomes obsolete; and, therefore, we have not burdened our pages with citations from authors, even the most erudite and respected, whose views we consider the present work to have, in the main, superseded." Other authors have written with some respect for the Mosaic account of the origin of our race, these denounce it as "crude and juvenile." "Viewed," say they, "as a narrative inspired by the Most High, its conceits are pitiful, and its revelations false. How then are its crude and juvenile hypotheses about *Human Creation* to be viewed!" Other ethnologists assert the unity of the human race in conformity with the teachings of Revelation. These deny it altogether. "How few," they say, "possess the moral power to break through a deep rooted prejudice."

Nature, sparing of such power, has reserved it for Messrs. Nott and Gliddon. "Although the present volume falls very far below the just requirements of science, we feel assured that it will, at least, aid materially in suggesting the right direction to future investigations." The direction here given is indicated in the following terms: "Through the slow but unerring laws of human advancement in knowledge, by the time that *theologists* shall have accomplished their metaphysical transition, and have awakened to the stern realities of the case, the developments of the science will have rendered any *new translation* [of the Bible] altogether supererogatory among the educated, who are creating *new religions* for themselves. Scientific truth, exemplified in the annals of astronomy, geology, chronology, and geographical distribution of animals, has literally fought its way, inch by inch, through false theology. The last grand battle between science and dogmatism, on the primitive origin of the races, has now commenced. It requires no prophetic eye to foresee that science must again and finally triumph." One of these triumphs of science will be to consign to hopeless, remediless degradation many of the races of mankind; and all but the Caucasian, to final extinction. This is the grand climacteric to which the science of Messrs. Nott and Gliddon aspires.

The extreme inequality of the races, both intellectual and moral, is the grand doctrine of the book. The inferiority of the Negro and the Indian, for example, is such that they are made by their Creator incapable of ever rising to the enjoyment of the blessings either of religion or of civilization. The inference indeed is, that they have no soul, and are formed for no higher destiny than the brutes that perish. "In the broad field and long duration of Negro life, not a single civilization, spontaneous or borrowed, has existed to adorn its gloomy past. Can any one call the name of a full-blooded Negro who has ever written a page worthy of being remembered? The monuments of Egypt prove that Negro races have not, during four thousand years at least, been able to make one solitary step, in Negro-land, from their savage state; the modern experience of the United States and the West Indies confirms the teachings of monuments and history; and our remarks on crania, herein-

after, seem to render fugacious all probability of a brighter future for these originally inferior types, however sad the thought may be. All along the eastern coast [of Africa] we encounter the various tribes inhabiting Inhambane, Sabia, Sofala, Botonga, Mozambique, Zanguebar, &c., each presenting physical characters more or less hideous; and, almost without exception, not merely in a barbarous, but superlatively savage state. All attempts at humanizing them have failed. Hopes of eventual improvement in the condition of these brutish families, are entertained by none but missionaries of sanguine temperament and little instruction. Even the *slaver* rejects them. In a word, the whole of Africa, south of 10° N. lat., shows a succession of human beings with intellects as dark as their skins, and with a cephalic conformation that renders all expectance of their future melioration an Utopian dream, philanthropical, but somewhat senile. The Black-African races, inhabiting the south of Egypt, have been in constant intercourse with her, as we prove from monuments, during four thousand years; and yet they have not made a solitary step towards civilization—neither will they, nor can they, until their physical organization becomes changed. Upon the moral and intellectual traits of such abject types, no impression has been made within five thousand years; none can be made, so far as science knows, until their physical organization becomes changed, by—silliest of desperate suppositions—a miracle. Divers lower races of humanity actually exist, uninvested by the Almighty with mental faculties adequate to the perception of religious sentiments."

The condition of the American Indians is equally hopeless. "We constantly read glowing accounts, from interested missionaries, of the civilization of these tribes; but a civilized, *full blooded* Indian does not exist among them. We see every day, in the suburbs of Mobile, and wandering through our streets, the remnant of the Choctaw race, covered with nothing but blankets, and living in bark tents, scarcely a degree advanced above the brutes of the field, quietly abiding their time. No human ingenuity can induce them to become educated, or to do an honest day's work; they are supported entirely by begging, besides a little traffic of the squaws in wood. To one who has

lived among American Indians, it is in vain to talk of civilizing them. You might as well attempt to change the nature of the buffalo. The mortal destiny of the whole American group is already perceived to be running out, like the sand in time's hour glass. Of 400,000 inhabitants of the Sandwich Islands, far less than 100,000 survive, and these are daily sinking beneath civilization, missionaries and rum. In New Holland, New Guinea, and many of the Pacific Islands, and other parts of the world, the same work of destruction is going on; and the labors of proselytism are vain, save to hasten its accomplishment."

"Nor can it be rationally affirmed, that the orang-outan and chimpanzee are more widely separated from certain African and Oceanic negroes, than are the latter from the Teutonic or Pelasgic types." "No line can be drawn between men and animals on the ground of 'reason,' and more than one of the savage races of men possess no perceptible moral or religious ideas." "Did space permit, I could produce historical testimonies by the dozen, to overthrow that postulate which claims for sundry inferior types of men any inherent recognition of *Divine Providence*—an idea too exalted for their cerebral organizations."

The genius of Milton has drawn out the hosts of the Universe in conflict. He admits no neutrals. We are involved in this great conflict, and under one or the other leader, consciously or unconsciously, we array ourselves. And surely

> Pandemonium, the high capital
> Of Satan and his peers,

could not desire more valiant champions to lead on the triumphs of sceptical science, and to anticipate the day of doom to more than half our race, when they

> Shall curse
> Their frail original and faded bliss;
> For whence
> But from the author of all ill, could spring
> So deep a malice to confound the race!

In this, their holy war against humanity and religion, these

valiant men are bound to die martyrs. Insatiate to pursue it, they fling back, in the face of all who plead for these doomed races the promises of revealed religion, derision and flat defiance. The foundations of society and religion are to be wholly broken up. The Bible is to be utterly annihilated by Mr. Gliddon alone, who bravely pants for the conflict, "resolved to pursue inquiries into biblical questions, *once for all, usque ad necem.*" And Dr. Nott himself, now sees nothing that would seem to "cast ominous conjecture on the whole success," though once disposed to counsel a little with discretion. "Our opinions and motives have been misrepresented and vilified by self-constituted teachers of the Christian religion. We have, in consequence, done with all this; and no longer have any apologies to offer, nor favors of lenient criticism to ask. The broad banner of science is herein nailed to the mast. Even in our brief day we have beheld one flimsy religious dogma after another consigned to oblivion, while science, on the other hand, has been gaining strength and majesty with time."

These men certainly have raised themselves to that "bad eminence" to which, we may thank heaven, few aspire. As champions of their *faith*, they may count upon having distanced competition; though as founders of a new *science*, they have mistaken their destiny. The book has not a single element of science. It presents no axioms, no reliable premises, no cautious inductions, no first principles of reasoning on which to base an argument for a sound conclusion. Postulates instead, it offers without number, assumptions without facts, theories without arguments, and conclusions the most monstrous and incoherent, without even colorable pretence of premise to give them plausibility. Grant them, for the sake of argument, the one principle they labor so earnestly, *the fixedness of a type*, it is still an open question, upon which the whole argument turns, whence the *origin* of the type. This, the *origin* of the type, not the *permanence* of it, is the main question at issue. They are pleased to assume that it is ascribable to original and separate acts of creation—if there ever were any creation—that imprinted upon the races each their peculiar type. Why so anxious to urge this conclusion? Can it be *because* it might unsettle the faith of men in our holy religion, and devote many

of the races to hopeless debasement and final extinction? One would think men would pause, examine with extreme care, and publish with great reluctance, theories that lead to such results, especially when wiser and better men find causes enough, physical and moral, for all the varieties of the race, perfectly in harmony with the deductions of reason and the teaching of Revelation.

It may be a law of nature, that with general uniformity, there shall be occasional deviations, giving a peculiar type to an individual, which, once originated, becomes perpetual in his lineage. Instances of this nature are of frequent occurrence in our domestic animals. Some of our readers may call to mind the famous breed of *short, bow-legged sheep*, which, a few years since, were common in the Green Mountains. These were found to be very useful from their inability to climb the stone fences which are so common on those rugged hills, while their flesh and fleece were as valuable as those of the common species. They were exterminated chiefly by the introduction of the Merino sheep. But they all originated from a single pair, descended from the common stock, with this congenital peculiarity. The famous porcupine family, and the supernumerary fingers and toes of certain families, are familiar examples of similar deviations from the common types, which, when once originated, perpetuate themselves, unless modified or obliterated by amalgamation with others. Now, in the long lapse of ages since the creation of man, why may not these occasional deviations in connection with a general uniformity, sufficiently account for all these "types of mankind?" To our authors this consideration ought to be all the more conclusive, as they give us the benefit of almost interminable ages—"for aught we yet know, thousands or millions of years," compared with which absorbing periods, that of their Egyptian monuments is but as yesterday—within the range of which, all these types may have originated.

Many volumes have been written on the subject of the "Types of Mankind," with learning, science, and force of argument infinitely beyond that of this visionary book, which show that its doctrine is but an idle theory, contradictory both to reason and revelation. To such authors we merely

refer, without repeating their arguments or renewing their discussions.

But we have several objections to the claims of the "Types of Mankind" to consideration as a book of science. One, in itself quite fatal is, that it does not adhere to what it calls its principles. They are not settled in the minds of the authors themselves. Even Agassiz himself has changed ground repeatedly, sometimes asserting the unity of the race as *one species*, then again resolving it into several species, and these postulates, his satellites, Messrs. Nott and Gliddon, have led off into conclusions as abhorrent, no doubt, to his feelings as to our own.

Dr. Morton's Crania Ægyptiaca was issued before the publication of the discoveries of Lepsius; and those of Rossellini, Champollion, &c., did not extend, with the exception of some meagre details, beyond the XIIth dynasty, by all these scholars then supposed to be the XVIIth, or about 1600 B. C. Messrs. Nott and Gliddon now go back almost three thousand years beyond this period, and find that "the physical traits which he had *assumed* as characteristic of the Egyptians, were really and truly typical of the first settlers of Egypt." After the publication of Lepsius' Denkmalen, "examination of these plates, and more thorough investigation" modified their "former conclusions." Dr. Morton also "made important modifications in some of his opinions." Five years after the publication of his work, he had "so far changed his opinions, as *to feel assured*, that the primodial Egyptians were not an Asiatic, but an aboriginal population indigenous to the Nile-land." These floating opinions, these *assumptions* and *feelings*, are the foundations of the "science" of the "Types of Mankind." What assurance have we, that Dr. Morton, if he had lived, would not again have changed his opinions? If living now, who can say that he would not indignantly disown all that Messrs. Nott and Gliddon have put forth under color of his authority?

But suppose we put ourselves under their guidance. How many "types" will they give us? Where begins the one and ends the other? Here, instead of the clear, distinct lines of demarcation which characterize true science, we have confusion worse confounded, in which the wildest fancy may run riot.

Grant them their "centres of creation." How many will they select? Where locate them? All is vague and indeterminate. And Mr. G., if, in his wanderings through the earth he should again stumble upon some new specimen of his "genus homo" of questionable type as to sex or lineage, has only to settle upon some new "centre of creation," and show up a new "type." Any day, if he shall chance to pick up a bug or worm which he has never seen before, and which even Agassiz knows not, he may establish a new "centre of creation." A new "type" is developed with which to enrich his science.

What is the discriminating characteristic of these "types?" It is not *color;* for our author tells us of whole races of black men who are not Negroes. The immense continent of New Holland is peopled by men of this description. "They are black, but without the features, woolly heads, or other physical characters of Negroes. Their color and features assimilate them to the African type; but their long, black, silky hair has a resemblance to the Malays." In Hindostan "we have either different races inhabiting the same climate for several thousand years without change, or the same race assuming every shade of color." "The inhabitants of Nubia though of a shining jet black, have not the smallest resemblance to the Negroes of western Africa."

The *hair* and *general features* are no criteria. The inhabitants of New Holland are generally a black race, as we are told above, but have long, black, silky hair. On the contrary, they of Van Diemen's Land, adjacent to New Holland, "are black, with *frizzled heads*, and very similar to the African races." "The hair is perfectly woolly. Their noses, though not flat, are broad and full. The lower part of the face projects a good deal." The Papuas of New Guinea are thus described: "Skin more or less black; features, Negro; hair woolly and formed into enormous tufts." "It is more fully demonstrated in Part II, that Negro races are never alluded to in ancient Jewish literature." The Egyptians had not the slightest affinity to the Negroes, the supposition would be fatal to the whole ethnography and philology of the book. But what were their features? "That the skins of the Egyptians in Grecian times, were much darker than those of Greeks and

other white races around the Archipelago, there can be no question: nor that this complexion was accompanied sometimes with curly or frizzled hair, tumid lips, slender limbs, small heads, with receding foreheads and chins, which, by contrast, excited the wonder or derision of the fair-skinned Hellenes." In regard to African tribes: "We have to remark, that some races with woolly hair and complexions of a deep black color, have fine forms, regular and beautiful features, and are in their figure and countenances scarcely different from Europeans. Other tribes have the forms and features similar to those above described, their complexion is black or a deep olive, or a copper color approaching to black, while their hair, though often crisp and frizzled, is not the least woolly. Among nations whose color deviates towards a lighter hue, we find some with woolly hair, with a figure and features approaching to European."

Neither the *skull*, nor the *brain*, nor the *size of the head*, forms any distinctive type. The Peruvians, the most civilized of the American tribes, were remarkable for the smallness of their heads and brain. "When we consider the institutions of the old Peruvians, their comparatively advanced civilization, their tombs and temples, mountain roads and monolithic gateways, together with their knowledge of certain ornamental arts, it is surprising to find that they possessed a brain no larger than the *Hottentot* or *New Hollander*, and far below the barbarous hordes of their own race." "It is interesting here to note that the ancient Egyptians and Hindoos, who in very early times reached a considerable degree of civilization, had, like the Mexicans and Peruvians, much smaller heads than the savage tribes around them." The Negro and the American Indian, according to our authors, are degraded by their Creator to the same low level, both alike incapable of civilization and moral culture, and yet their heads are totally unlike each other; showing that neither the brain nor the skull is any indication of mental or moral character. "One might, indeed, describe an Indian's skull by saying, it is the opposite in every respect from that of the Negro; as much as the brown complexion of the red man is distinguishable from the black's; or

the long hair of the former differs in substance from the short wool of the latter."

Even the *size of the head*, about which so much has been said of late, is no indication of the strength of the mental capacities. Cuvier and Daniel Webster were great men, and they had large heads; but by the concession of Dr. Wyman himself, it "is well known there are several heads in Boston larger than Mr. Webster's." The dealers in hats often have calls for patterns an inch and an inch and a half larger in circumference than that of Mr. Webster. Dr. Nott says: "I have myself, in the last few weeks, measured half a dozen heads as large or larger than Mr. Webster's," while in the same sentence he shows, that the heads of the ancient Egyptians, whose abilities he seems to hold in the highest respect, were exceedingly diminutive, scarcely exceeding those of the Indian or the Negro. The whole subject of Craniology, on which Dr. Morton wasted so much talent and enthusiasm, however curious, is very uncertain and unsatisfactory.

Our authors themselves admit, that "it is impossible to say precisely what each type originally was." The "types" are hopelessly commingled. "It would be a vain task at the present day to attempt any unravelling of this tangled thread, and to make any thing like a just classification of types." "We have shown that no classification of races, yet put forth, has any foundation whatever in nature." What claim then has the "Types of Mankind," to the least consideration as a book of science, when the whole subject of which it treats offers not a single elementary principle as a basis on which to build?

We object to the profiles and cuts of Egyptian statuary and skulls as unsatisfactory. What evidence have we of the *accuracy* of these original portraits made by those rude artists, according to Mr. G., six thousand years since? Some were coarse colossal statues, some bas-reliefs, so marred and distorted, that nothing could be made of them until the outer coatings were taken off. Is there no chance here that a slip of the pencil, an unskilful hand, a vagrant fancy, or a crude conjecture may have distorted the lineaments of the face, caricaturing one and lending new traits to another? In truth, the originals themselves are grotesque, not to say burlesque, caricatures of the

human form. The authors themselves acknowledge this difficulty, and, in one instance, have given three different cuts of the same subject, "in proof of how artists differ." These cuts would hardly allow the original to be cousin-german to himself. And yet these are the scientific demonstrations given to prove, that the swarthy or black Egyptian, "with curly or frizzled hair, tumid lips, slender limbs, small heads, with receding forehead and chin," differed, *toto coelo*, from the Negro! And in regard to the difficulty of distinguishing between different types, our authors themselves say: "In Europe, Asia and Africa, we encounter infinite diversities among human beings, manifested in every form and by all colors."

We have mentioned one hypothesis to account for the diversities of the human race, in consistency with its origin from a single pair. We mention another, which is in entire accordance with the ascertained facts. It is, that there was a physical and mental difference in the three sons of Noah, established at their birth by the intention of the Almighty, and that here lay the germ of all the subsequent development. By the prophecy, for example, the descendants of Japheth were to be conquering races, taking possession of the Shemitish countries and dominating over the descendants of Ham. We know that it is so. Even infidels admit the facts substantially, and a most brilliant and beautiful confirmation of them, has been wrought out in the splendid discoveries of Bopp in Comparative Philology. But what second causes secured this result as to the descendants of Japheth? Granting every thing that may be said as to the influence of climate, food, religion, culture, may there not be a peculiarity of race lying back of all this? If we can trace similarity of character in nations and families now, may not the regal character of the Japhethian races have been first germinally in Japheth himself? Observe, for example, how in the very transaction of their father's transgression, Ham shows himself, with his son Canaan, to possess qualities entirely different from those of Shem and Japheth. These were reverent and noble, those mean and sensual. The more the subject of *headship* is studied, the more will it be seen that the entire social system is based upon it.

In regard to the alleged antiquity of races earlier than the

time of Noah, we are not very careful to answer, until we have something more certain to go upon than Egyptian notions. There are four postulates, at least, that must be established, before we can adopt the immense periods claimed for Egyptian existence.

1. We must be sure that the hieroglyphics are read with perfect accuracy. We may admit that great and interesting progress has been made in this direction, without yielding implicit credence to every one of the minutiæ in all the books upon Egypt, especially as they do not agree.

2. We must be sure that none of the dynasties were contemporaneous. Our readers are aware that the chronology is made out, by taking all the names of the kings found in *cartouches*, and arranging them in a long line, end for end, and concluding that Menes, the first king, lived at the beginning of the series. But suppose, that like the houses of York and Lancaster, or the Saxon heptarchy, or the three popes at once, or the thirty-one governors of our States, there may have reigned many kings at once in Upper and Lower Egypt, &c., and so their names may have crept into the hieroglyphics. Then of course, there would be that much error in arranging them as successive.

3. We must be sure that the hieroglyphic-makers were well informed. They may have gathered together mere traditions, or merely inscribed the nearest approximations to the truth they could find. How extremely uncertain all this is, may be seen in the searching criticisms of Niebuhr on the early history of Greece and Rome.

4. We must be sure that the Egyptians meant to tell the truth. Their character for honesty is none of the best. Besides, all nations like to make themselves as old as they can, and why should the notions of the Egyptians on this subject be any more reliable than those, for example, of the Chinese and East Indians?

When these postulates become certainties, we shall be more disturbed about Scriptural chronology. The LXX Version, as is well known, admits an earlier creation of the human race. This is a simple question of choice between two sources of truth. The advocates of either bow to the paramount authority

of Revelation, and if the latter best suits all the evidence we have, there seems no objection to admitting it.

It will be perceived that not only is the doctrine of this book repulsive to every feeling of humanity, and calculated to destroy every fine emotion of civilization, but that its relation to revealed religion is clearly that of infidelity. The great central doctrine of Revelation is, that in consequence of one man's transgression, all, of every clime, color, condition and character have become sinners. This sinful, corrupt, depraved character is the universal type of mankind. No language can be plainer or more explicit than that of Revelation on this subject. To limit these representations to any one race or to any number of races, is not merely to wrest the Scriptures from their obvious meaning, but to allow a principle of interpretation that would pervert or annul the meaning of all language, put darkness for light, and cloud with total obscurity every thing that has been or can be written.

The great scheme of redeeming grace is equally attempted to be set aside by this book. Here again nothing can be plainer than the declarations of Revelation, that the provisions of this grace are open alike to the whole human race, from the Caucasian to the Hottentot. No language can be more full, more explicit, more universal in its application than that which sets forth the offering of the great atoning sacrifice of the Son of God, and throws abroad over all the world the wide welcome of his redeeming grace to all, whosoever will receive it. It were vain, on points so obvious as these and so universally conceded, to adduce individual texts. We will rather file in evidence the whole volume of God's Word, all and single, from the beginning to the end. To this evidence we know well that Messrs. Nott and Gliddon will take exceptions, but we are equally certain, that the subscribers and purchasers who have been led to waste their money on this book, will cast it away indignantly when they shall learn that the design of it is to wrest from them the Word of God, and substitute in place of its cheerful hopes and consolations, a bleak and frigid infidelity which can find no stopping place short of Atheism.

The geologist, the naturalist and the archæologist, often admonish us that science has nothing to do with religion.

They claim the right, accordingly, to press their researches and inductions to their final conclusions, regardless of the relations which these may have to the teachings of Revelation. To this we are far from having any objection. Every science should rest on its own appropriate evidence, and we need have no fear but truth will be consistent with itself. But when a *soi disant* ethnologist affirms that the several races or types of mankind had each a distinct parentage, that the Scriptures are addressed only to the proud Caucasian race, and contemplate only its moral character and destiny, the question is no longer one of pure science. The contradiction of Scripture is plain and express. The Bible or the "ethnologist," one or the other, is mistaken. So these writers practically present the question. They make no effort to reconcile their developments with the teaching of Revelation; discarding its authority, they waste half their book in a feebly impotent effort to consign to contempt and oblivion whatever in the Scriptures militate against their conclusions.*

* We confess our surprise and regret that so respectable a journal as Putnam's Monthly Magazine, should have admitted an Article such as their leading one for July, entitled "Is Man One or Many?" We have had some bright hopes for this Monthly, especially on account of its American feeling, and its soundness upon some important social questions. But we have observed, with regret, as it has gone more and more into the excitement of competition, too much of a disposition to insert any thing that would make a sensation, and so bring the Magazine into notice and promote its sale. This is *not* the method to produce a journal of which the country would be proud.

The Article in question, we say it with pain, shuts up its readers to the miserable alternatives of Infidelity or Swedenborgianism. We shall admit no such alternative. The ravings of Swedenborg are not received as of any value by one Christian man or minister in five hundred. It is gratuitous, it is almost insulting to Christians of every name, to pretend to put forth such things as a possible interpretation of Scripture. Both the Old and New Testaments are *express* as to a literal and historic descent of the whole human race from one man: Gen. ix. 19, "These are the three sons of Noah: and of them was the whole earth overspread," Acts, xvii. 26, the Apostle Paul declares to the philosophers of Athens concerning the true God, "And hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth." We hope Putnam's Magazine will leave it to such men as Gliddon and Nott to take infidel ground, either openly or by Swedenborgian circuits. Christians sustain Scripture in its simple

We shall enter upon no defence of the Bible. "It needs none." Its defence is the munition of rocks which has withstood for thousands of years the assaults of its enemies in every form. We, certainly, after what it has endured unharmed from the trained veterans of infidelity, feel no concern for its safety under the attack of these raw recruits, however vauntingly they may advance to the onset.

> *They* were gigantic minds, and their steep aim
> Was, Titan-like, on daring doubts to pile
> Thoughts which should call down thunder—

*These* we feel almost ashamed to busy ourselves in brushing out of our way.

If their Creator had given them powers commensurate with their desires and their principles, they would indeed be formidable foes of revealed truth. When neither the feelings of humanity, the modesty of science, nor reverence for the Word of God, form any bar to the deductions of reckless and conceited sciolism, we might have some ground for apprehension, did we not find the appropriate antagonism in the weakness of its understanding and the madness of its zeal. We owe it to the bounty of Providence that the lowest depravity of the heart confounds its worst designs and counteracts its worst principles, while it makes the same man at once the most wicked and the most harmless of beings. Without meaning to bring down upon the unsheltered heads of these men the entire force of this maxim, we must nevertheless say, that the infidelity of this book, masked under a show of learning and wielded by a dexterous sophistry, might have beguiled the unlearned and unstable with arguments which they were alike unable to refute and unwilling to believe. But these men have brought the whole question to an issue on which every Christian, of the humblest capacity, may determine for himself. He may know little of ethnography, and less of Mr. Gliddon's "biblical profundities," but when he is brought to choose between them and

historical sense. God speaks truth and truth only, and His Word can take abundant care of itself, without being explained away into folly and incoherence.

God's Word, he lays down this big, foolish quarto, in an instant, and addresses himself to something practical, thanking God that myriads even of the obnoxious Indians and Negroes have been, and are to be, so blessed, as to be made equal unto the angels,* by the living power of Divine truth.

We do not charge upon the authors any intention or desire to subserve the cause of humanity and religion, while we gratefully notice another service of this nature, in carrying out the speculations of Agassiz to their legitimate conclusions. This great naturalist and adroit tactician would not have hazarded the avowal of principles which shock every feeling of humanity, and overthrow the first principles of religion. He began these daring speculations with an earnest endeavour to reconcile them with the Word of God. In the progress of his inquiries, he seems to have advanced reluctantly to the vortex to which he was drifting. With instinctive caution, he more than once, we believe, displayed a sudden and masterly change of tactics. Certain it is that he has exchanged the theory of diversity of species in the several races of men, for a diversity of origin. He now admits that the races all belong to one species, "equally endowed with the same superior nature," so that they may claim kindred with each other, on the ground of "that general bond which unites all men of every nature." Still they have not a common parentage, but derive their origin from different and distinct centres of creation. We recognize in these views of the great naturalist, a kindness which seems to embrace the whole human race. His genial philanthropy might almost reconcile us to his speculations, as the harmless assumptions of an enthusiast in natural science; but these authors, without either the caution or the humanity of their master, sieze upon his assumptions, and rush with them at once to their legitimate and startling conclusions. They seem indeed to be peculiarly emulous of distinction, as foremost and loudest in that yell of congratulation and triumph, with which the whole crew of infidel philosophers have received the fanciful deductions of the great naturalist. These discordant notes, we might hope, would startle the philosopher himself from his revery, and teach

* ἰσάγγελοι. Luke xx. 36.

him to call in question the soundness of his theories. But, however that may be, this Christian community will not fail to take the alarm, and draw back from the scepticism to which Agassiz was leading them, by the authority of his great name, and the power of his great learning. To Messrs. Nott and Gliddon, all thanks, though they meant not so, for this timely warning, this seasonable exemplification of the sure and certain results of these subtle theories of Agassiz. We lament that he has given up his honored name to associations so unworthy; but we have no fear that the world will give up its Revelation, its religion, its hopes, its immortality, for the sake of an hypothesis in natural history, founded only upon conjecture, and which is fast becoming the rallying cry of the whole host of sceptics.

The theory is rejected by the great majority of naturalists themselves, and to them we may safely remit the whole question of the unity of the race. The works of Prichard, Balbi, Adelung, Rougemont, and Doctors Smith and Bachman, exhibit a noble array of talent and learning in its defence against what we must regard as mere hypothesis.

Dr. Nott concludes his Introduction with a sentence from Burke: "Nature has nothing to reveal that is not noble and beautiful and good;" followed by his paraphrase: "Man can *invent* nothing in science or religion but falsehood; and all the truths which he *discovers*, are but facts or laws which have emanated from the Creator. All science, therefore, may be regarded as a revelation from Him; and, although newly discovered laws or facts in nature, may conflict with religious *errors* which have been written and preached for centuries, they never can conflict with religious truth. There must be harmony between the works and the words of the Almighty, and whenever they *seem* to conflict, the discord has been produced by the ignorance or wickedness of man."

All very truly and justly said; and nothing can more forcibly condemn this book. It reveals nothing "noble," nothing "beautiful," nothing "good," and, therefore, cannot be a record of "newly discovered laws or facts in nature." It conflicts with "the *words* of the Almighty," and contradicts them on every page. Accordingly it neither reveals nor re-

cords the *works* of the Almighty. What it pretends to reveal as "newly discovered laws or facts in nature," is in such undeniable conflict with God's own Word, that Dr. Nott himself brings us irresistibly to the conclusion that this discord between the Types of Mankind and the Bible, has been produced by "the ignorance or wickedness of man."

With this disposition of the subject we might rest. The "Types of Mankind" deserves not a respectful notice. The argument, if indeed it have any, requires not a serious refutation. The design of the work is sufficiently obvious, and the execution is as gross as the design. The weakness of the argument is only surpassed by the wickedness of the object of the book; one-half of which is directed to an effort on the part of Mr. Gliddon, to ridicule the Bible. Arrogance and denunciation have so long been received as argument, that one by the ready use of these, fancies himself a man of abilities, and is in danger of being mistaken as such by others. We have no expectation of dispelling the illusion of Mr. G.'s conceptions of himself; but, for other reasons, it seems necessary to pay to him the undeserved compliment of noticing some of his aspersions of the Word of God.

The reader, we trust, will not mistake Mr. Gliddon's style for ours. Lest he should, however, read carelessly, we will be careful to distinguish by quotation marks. This giant in "continental criticism" and "archæological profundities," begins with a valiant onslaught upon the whole Bible, and after selecting two or three passages for critical dissection, proceeds to submit "*seriatim*, positive examples of the errors of our truly vulgar version for every letter of the English alphabet." Then, after gravely admonishing us that he has no right at present to anticipate any doubts about "the historical inaccuracies" of the Bible, "considering the averments of œcumenic Protestantism of the orthodox sects, that '*the Bible is the revealed Word of God*,'" he exhorts the reader to divest his mind, as far as in him lies, of pre-conceived biases. Thus divested, standing *in puris naturalibus*, Mr. Gliddon's subject becomes a good *clairvoyant* for this great necromancer. He now confines his manipulations to the five books of Moses, assuring us in the high bombastic of the pro-

fession, that "if the *Pentateuch* was originally penned in the Mosaic autograph, the proof will resile to our view, through archæological deductions, with the force of an Euclidian demonstration."

But even the Pentateuch is too large for his operations; he, therefore, confines himself chiefly to the tenth Chapter of Genesis—showing how true to nature the old Greek was, who represents a man as capable of bearing about with him a single brick as a sample of the house he was offering for sale—because "if we hold all the books of the Bible to be equally inspired, the tenth chapter of the first book will be found unquestionably to be true likewise." But the reverse of this is the real issue to which Mr. G. would bring us, that if this chapter be found to be erroneous, then will all the books of the Bible be equally false. Such is his argument, causing the whole system of revealed religion, and all that is enduring in the hopes connected with redeeming grace, to turn upon the question whether the sons of Noah and their immediate posterity, actually settled in the provinces and countries which were assigned to them in the tenth Chapter of Genesis; as though all the books of the Bible were written at once, and by the same man, and as though a corruption in the text of one book, if there were such a thing, would invalidate the whole.

Before proceeding to the examination of Mr. G.'s biblical criticism, we must notify our readers of his extreme modesty, and his gentle courtesy towards American scholars.

"'Αυτοδίδακτοι, like Abderitan Democritus, in some branches of oriental philology; and possessing, furthermore, an apparatus tolerably complete of *continental* criticism in biblical matters; we prefer direct references to the Hebrew text." Mr. G. next admonishes us "that no one is competent to impugn these deductions who is unacquainted, not merely with the original Hebrew and Greek languages, but with the noble achievements of continental exegesis." We are admonished, moreover, that unless "profound in Hebrew," we must be cautious how we tamper with his etherial weapons. "Walton, Kennicott, De Wette, to say nothing of other sources, the reader perceives, are tolerably familiar to me. To extract from their works is merely mechanical." He recognizes "no clap-trap to acquaint-

ance with hieroglyphical arcana recently made by theologers who speak not any continental tongue through which alone these subjects are accessible—no *ad captandem* figments of the possession of oriental knowledge, when men cannot spell a monosyllable written in the Hebrew alphabet." He has "a biblical port-folio" filled by "more than ten years of incessant travel"—the best possible qualification for a self-taught Hebrew scholar, no doubt—but he has such a port-folio stuffed with materials for a full volume, which he mourns that he is obliged to suppress, but falls complacently back upon one idea terribly monitory to us: "The nature of this work may elicit some hostile comments, and he is a prudent soldier who keeps his powder dry." *Verbum horrendi carminis!* Mr. G. is fond of Latin; but his classic erudition seems not to have suggested to him what a Roman poet has taught us to anticipate from such portentous notes of preparation:

Parturiunt montes, nascetur—ridiculus mus.

The gentleness, the courtesy, the condescension of this profound continental philologist, is quite overpowering: "simpletons," "impudent," "ignorant," "idiotic," "unliteral dogmatists," "biblical dunces," "in that undeveloped stage of the reasoning faculties which has been already classified as *theological*," "dogmatism peeping from out of its theological chrysalis," "puerilities of the ephemeral tourist, twaddling inanities of the unlettered missionary, or the Egyptian hallucination of the theological rhapsodist." These are the chaste and classic terms, so indicative of their author, in which he speaks of the biblical scholars of America.

We are now to follow Mr. G., "seriatim," in his critique upon the translators of "our truly vulgar version;" in which we are to behold "a little of the damning evidence produceable that these worthies [the translators of the English version of the Scriptures] could not construe a single line of the Hebrew text." This series of texts, successively indicated by the letters of the alphabet, Mr. G. offers as an "*experimentum crucis*"—by way of testing the vaunted accuracy of "its *forty-seven* translators." "Bounding retrogressively over the inter-

val that divides our generation from that of his Majesty King James, the scholar is requested to take with us the historical era of the promulgature of the *authorized version*, viz., A. D. 1611." By this retrogressive bound, our inquisitor pounces upon Job xix. 23, as his first victim:

A. "Oh that my words were now written! Oh that they were *printed in a book!*"

By the torture of his *experimentum crucis*, Mr. G. brings out what he styles "the ridiculous anachronism, perpetrated in King James's version, that makes Job wish that his words were *printed*, probably two thousand five hundred years before the art was invented." "How forty-seven able-bodied men could have overlooked this blunder while correcting proof, surpasses comprehension." Mr. G. then, after a witty pun upon "Job printing," and a gentle intimation to the reader, that unless he be "profound in Hebrew, his opinion upon either rendering is alike worthless to himself and others," at length gives his version to this effect: "What more simple than to have *printed* what the 'original sacred tongues' read *inscribed in a register?*"

Any one is profound enough in common sense, whatever he may be in Hebrew, to perceive that the translators meant to transfer the thought expressed by the original, *so as to be thoroughly appreciable in the language in which it was to be read.*

Books were originally written in rolls, but in our language, the appropriate term is not *a roll*, but *a book*, like the Book of the Law, the Book of Kings, &c., and the same rule of accommodation led sensible men to speak of published words as *printed*, not *inscribed in a register.*

B. Job xxxi. 35. "Behold my desire is that the Almighty would answer me, and that mine adversary had written a book."

"If this text be 'divinely inspired' in King James's version, then the Lord have mercy on his creature *archæology!*" This profound sentiment is followed by a characteristic jest about Job's writing a *review* of his enemies' *book.* The word in the original is the same that in the first passage is rendered *a book*, and takes the meaning of *a book*, *a bill*, or *written instrument of any kind*, according as the context requires. The desire of Job is that his adversary would record a specific charge or

complaint in writing, and in fact just such a complaint is called in our language a *libel*, which comes from a Latin word signifying *a little book*. The translators might have selected some such phrase, perhaps, with greater propriety; but here again the question at issue is one only of taste and judgment. It avails nothing with respect to the ignorance or skill of the translators in the Hebrew text.

C. Psa. lxxviii. 41. "They turned back, and tempted God, and limited the Holy One of Israel."

"Bad as the Jews were, in this case they did precisely the contrary: 'They (became) converted, they supplicated the Puissant' and implored TaU [i. e. 'absolution' or 'benediction'] 'of the Holy One of Israel.'" The word is תָּוָּתוּ from תָּוָה which occurs in no other passage; but the connection plainly shows that it means, to cause one to *grieve*, to *abhor*, or to *repent*. So it is interpreted by Gesenius and De Wette, with whom Mr. G. professes to be "tolerably familiar," by Winer, and by Fürst, the great Hebrew lexicographer. The Jews distrusted, and by their distrust, tempted, grieved, displeased the Holy One. See vs. 19, 20, and the whole connection; "Can God furnish a table in the wilderness? Can He give bread also? Can He provide flesh for His people?" Our translators, retaining this general idea, added a peculiar shade, "they *limited* the Holy One," that is, they offended Him by doubting the power of the Omnipotent to work these miracles in the wilderness. Mr. Gliddon's translation is liable to these trifling objections: 1. It is an utter violation of the meaning indicated by the context, and 2. It is a fanciful perversion of another root having the same radicals, but totally different in meaning.

D. 1 Samuel xxi. 10—15. David feigns madness before Achish, who says to his servants, "Have I need of madmen that ye have brought this *fellow* to play the madman in my presence? Shall this fellow come into my house?"

Mr. G. reports the interpretation of Lanci to the effect, that David celebrated the power of Achish and his men "in a varied *hymn* and in *inspired* verses, and at each commencement of a strophe he made תָּוּ TaU, [i. e. he made 'benedictions,' he blessed them,] and already the *sweat* was dripping upon the chin's honor, [i. e. the beard, in Oriental phraseology,] when

Achish interrupted him and said to his servants, 'Hearken to this man, who affects inspiration (literally 'comes the inspired;') are poets wanting to me, that you must bring this one to celebrate my power, and shall (such as) he come into my house?'" Over this extraordinary display of exegetical skill, Mr. G. raises this refined note of exultation, "Who seem most cracked, David, or the bibliolaters of King James's version?" Perhaps the "*experimentum crucis*" never was applied with greater severity than in this instance, not to the translators, but to their emendators. The Hebrew דַּלְתוֹת הַשַּׁעַר *doors of the gate*, which have a meaning more uniform and distinct than any other perhaps in the language, are here made to mean the *stanzas* or *strophes* of poetry. The words occur in 1 Chron. xxii. 3, in precisely the same form, save that the word for gate is plural, when David prepares iron in abundance for the nails for "*the doors of the gates.*" Was David here preparing iron to make nails for the *stanzas of his psalms?* Then he made TaU, i. e. made benedictions, instead of "scrabbling on the doors of the gate." The word means, *to make a sign or mark*, as may be seen in the following passages, where alone it occurs in the Bible. Num. xxxiv. 7, 10, "Ye shall *point out* for you Mount Hor." You shall *note* or *mark* Mount Hor, as the northern landmark of your border. "Ye shall *point out* your east border." Try now Mr. G.'s interpretation, "Ye shall make TaU, i. e. '*benedictions*' for you, Mount Hor." "Ye shall make TaU, i. e. '*benedictions*' your east border." Such "biblical profundities" are too deep for us. Ezekiel (ix. 4,) directs the man with the writer's ink-horn to go through the city and "*set a mark*" upon the foreheads of all the men that sigh and cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof. If he merely blessed the men, what was the use of the ink-horn?

E. Levit. xi. 20. "All fowls that creep, going upon all fours, shall be an abomination to you."

"To us likewise! Raræ aves, invaluable however to museums of natural history." To this poor jest it is sufficient to suggest, that in the lapse of time the word *fowl* may have become limited in signification; and may originally have meant as in the Hebrew, any "*flying creature.*" In the very next

verse the same words are translated "*flying creeping thing that goeth upon all four;*" in verse 23, "*flying creeping things that have four feet,*" and in Deut. xiv. 19, "every creeping thing that flieth." The German word *vogel* seems to be the same as our *fowl;* and one of the meanings for it in the German Dictionary is *butterfly*, precisely the case before us, *a winged insect.* The Hebrew constantly makes these three classes; beasts, flying creatures, and creeping things without wings. Our translators expressed the second class, sometimes, by the word "fowl." This is the whole case.

We quote from Webster's Dictionary in voc.:—

"Fowl, [Sax. *fugel, fugl;* G. & D. *vogel;* Dan. *fugl;* Sw. *fogel;* from the root of the L. *fugio, fugo;* Gr. φεύγω, and signifying *flying animal.*]

"A flying or winged animal; the generic name of certain animals that move through the air by the aid of wings. . . . . *Bird* is etymologically, a young *fowl*, or chicken. But it has usurped the place of *fowl*, and is now commonly used as the generic term, though this is not in accordance with its etymology.

"*Fowl* is used as a collective noun. We dined on fish and *fowl.* Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the *fowl* of the air, Gen. i. But this use in America is not frequent."

"We refreshen ourselves with"

F. 2 Kings, vi. 25. "There was a great famine in Samaria; and behold they besieged it until an ass' head was sold for fourscore pieces of silver, and the fourth part of a cab of doves' dung for five pieces of silver."

After some coarse jesting about this "delicate repast," Mr. G. inquires, "Can any one conceive a human stomach, however depraved by want, alimented upon guano?" He then declares that the word indicates the "*chick-pea;*" the commonest oriental "vetch or pea."

Now after all the light thrown by Oriental scholars upon Hebrew, De Wette, Gesenius and Fürst adopt the rendering of our translators. Mr. Gliddon has picked up, somewhere, the rendering of Bochart, which has been carefully examined and rejected by Celsius, Rosenmüller and Winer. The latter adduces several instances of similar expedients, under extreme

famine, and alleges that precisely the same means of alleviating hunger were employed in England under Edward II., A. D. 1316. We must leave Mr. G. to "refreshen" himself with his own garbage, while we pass on to

G. Levit. xxi. 18. "He that hath a flat nose [is forbidden] to approach to offer the bread of his God."

This is made the occasion of some refined innuendos about "negrophilism" and "impure blood" as "debarring from the tabernacle," preliminary to the following flight of eloquence respecting the milder dispensation under which we live: "Happily—no thanks to our translators—snubs of universal humanity may legally officiate at sanctuaries; the word meaning only a *mutilated* nose." Now the verb from which this is derived, means to *shut up*, to *shut in*, to *enclose*, from which the word *harem* is derived. The passage speaks not of one of Mr. G.'s immutable "types," but of a special deformity, just such as flatness in this feature would be among Jews, who are remarkable for high noses. It describes a nose *drawn in—flattened*. So it is rendered by Gesenius and De Wette. The intention was to produce in the minds of the people the idea of moral perfection. Hence any priest whose person deviated materially from their idea of beauty, was forbidden to officiate.

H. Sol. Song i. 5. "I am *black* but comely."

After some characteristic raillery about the Church confessing "her deformity" and "very probable amalgamation," Mr. G. makes his "pretty Shulamite brunette" say, "I am *brown*, (*tanned*) but pretty," and then admonishes us that no one "is competent to impugn these deductions who is unacquainted, not merely with the original Hebrew and Greek languages, but with the noble achievements of continental exegesis."

Zechariah (vi. 1—7) saw in a vision four chariots. The horses of one were *white*, of another *grizzled*, of a third *red* or *bay*, and of the fourth the horses were *black*, the same word in Hebrew as "our brunette." Were those horses also *tanned brown?* In the eleventh verse of the fifth chapter of this very Song, the bride in celebrating the beauty of the Beloved, says, "his locks are bushy and *black as a raven*." The Hebrew word is the same. Is the raven a *brunette, tanned brown?* We

leave it for others more deeply versed in the "noble achievements of continental exegesis" to decide.

I. Habakkuk ii. 11. "The stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it."

The Gliddonic critical acumen is here so decidedly rich, that we cannot refuse our readers a single word of it: "That a stone should cry out from a wall, is an idea consonant with Oriental hyperbole; but that a *beam* should answer out of timber, seems to be an unpoetical and far-fetched conception, as it presupposes the proximity of a 'timber-yard' to the wall aforesaid. It furthermore is not in unison with the context; wherein the prophet declares against Chaldean flagitiousness. The propriety of his metaphor resides to view through Lanci's rendering and notes of interrogation. 'Peradventure shall the *statue of stone* [an Assyrian bas-relief?] from the wall cry out? The *cricket* [scarabæus or beetle] from out of the wood, will it respond?'"

The word rendered "beam" occurs only in this place in all the Scriptures, but it is so rendered here by De Wette, Gesenius and Fürst, together with the ancient interpreters, Symmachus and Jerome. It is derived from a word meaning *to bind*, and naturally suggests the beam or timber that binds together the parts of a house. Nobody but Gliddon and Lanci ever had any difficulty in understanding the terrible denunciation of the prophet against covetousness. The stones of his house, built by wrong and blood, cry out against the oppressor, and its timbers echo back the cry. Every one recollects the fearful effect with which Dr. Beecher uses the figure in his Sermons on Intemperance.

A solemn old statue, in a stately house, crying out against its owner's rapacity and cruelty, and a cricket "responding"! The bathos is unfathomable. We cannot even approximate it, but the nearest we can come to it, is the story of the imaginative Irishman, who—but he tells the story himself—"I returned to the halls of my fathers by night, and I found them in ruins. I cried aloud, 'My fathers! where are they!' and echo responded, 'Is that you, Patrick M'Glathery?'"

J. Zech. ix. 17. "Corn shall make the *young men* cheerful, and new wine the *maids*."

"Here our *forty-seven* have metamorphosed *famines* into '*young men*,' and *sorrows* into '*maids*.'" Now let the Bible again be its own interpreter. Psalm cxlviii. 12, calls upon every thing, animate and inanimate, to praise the Lord, "Kings of the earth and all people; princes and all judges of the earth; both *young men* and *maidens*"—no! oh ignorant *forty-seven!* both "famines" and "sorrows." Isa. lxii. 5, "As a young *man* marrieth a *virgin*,"—that is, as *famine* marrieth *sorrow*—"so shall thy sons marry thee." Deut. xxxii. 25, "The sword without and terror within, shall destroy both the *young man* and the *virgin*,"—that is, the sword without and terror within, shall destroy both famine and sorrow! Did Mr. Gliddon ever read the treatise entitled, "An humble Attempt to show that a Man will write better on a Subject, by knowing something about it"?

"*Per saltum*, inasmuch as in the chaos of our memoranda of *false translations*, orderly classification is inconvenient, we open—"

K. Genesis xxiii. 9, 17, 19, "The cave of Machpela," (*sic.*), to find it not a proper name, but "a thing contracted for." We cannot even allow Mr. G. this small matter. He is as inaccurate in little things as in great. His mind is not even of the microscopic sort. Observe, to begin with, that if Machpelah is *not* a proper name, that it does not mean what Mr. G. says it does. Rosenmüller in loc. mentions, that in the LXX. it is τὸ σπήλαιον τό διπλοῦν, *the double cave*, and that this was also a Hebrew opinion. Winer gives the same derivation as Ros., from כָּפַל *duplicem esse* or *duplicavit*. But both agree that it is here a proper name, as does also Dr. Robinson, and, we imagine, every body else. The word for *cave* is the same as that which describes the hiding place of the five kings in Josh. x. 16—18, *the cave of Makkedah*, upon the mouth of which great stones were rolled to keep them. No one can mistake the meaning there. Mr. G.'s refinement makes the cave of Machpelah, the cave of "a thing contracted for!"

L. M. 1 Sam. xix. 13, 16, "Michal took an image and laid it in the bed, with a pillow of goat's hair for his bolster, and covered it with a cloth. And when the messengers came in, behold

there was an image in the bed, with a pillow of goats' hair for his bolster."

After some refined insinuations respecting the sex of the image, and "scandalous suspicions" about this image itself, we are told that the translators, "having commenced rolling down hill, reach the bottom through a series of cascades that would excite Homeric smiles, were not 'God's Word' the sufferer." The result is, that this image was a *casket of jewels.*

The original denotes the *teraphim*, often mentioned with the ephod. We will give a specimen of the authorities for translating the word *image* or *images*, collected by a Göttingen Doctor of Philosophy, in Kitto's Cyclopædia. The LXX. render εἴδωλον, γλυπτον. Aquila renders μορφώματα, προτομαί, &c. Symmachus translates εἴδωλα. Onkelos gives צלמנרא *images.* So far the Göttingen Doctor. Turning now to Rosenmüller Schol. on Gen. xxxi. 19, we find: "That *teraphim* were esteemed as gods, is plain from verse 30. That they were household gods, is clear from Jud. xvii. 5; 1 Sam. xix. 13. In this place all the ancients (*omnes veteres*) render *teraphim* by images (imagines.) LXX. εἴδωλα. Josephus Antiqq. 1, 19, 9, calls them τύπους θεῶν. Aben Ezra thinks they were made in the human form." So far from showing ignorance, our translators have with them the entire weight of authority; and besides, the transaction itself shows, that Michal intended to deceive the messengers by putting an image in the bed, which she meant to pass off for David. The translation, *casket of jewels*, is mere nonsense.

N. Levit. xvi. 8, 10, 26. These passages relate to the *scapegoat* of the Levitical law, which Mr. G. informs us means *azazel*, an attribute of Jehovah, equivalent to "the God of victory." The subject is confessedly a difficult one. The word occurs only in this chapter, in connection with the solemnities of the great day of Atonement. Many different interpretations have been given. Josephus declares that this goat "is sent alive out of the camp, into the wilderness, for a scapegoat, to be an expiation for the sins of the people." Jahn gives the same account; and Winer, after discussing the subject at length, declares himself in favor of the same interpretation. Our version, therefore, is sustained by high authorities. Mr. G. is curiously

unfortunate in his criticisms. There is absolutely no authority for his notion obtained from Lanci. The men of weight who dissent from the received interpretation, as Hengstenberg, Rosenmüller, &c., make *azazel* to be an evil demon. One can only wonder that the Egyptian consul did not stumble somewhere on this well known and more plausible correction of the "forty-seven."

O. Job xxi. 15. "Who is the Almighty that we should serve him? and what profit should we have if we pray unto him?" "Let the reader now compare," saith Gliddon, "King James' version with the subjoined." "Who is the most Valorous, that to him we must be servants? Who the most Sublime, that we should go [out of our way] to meet him?"

To render נוֹעֵיל "*the most Sublime*" is an unauthorized conceit. It is not a noun, but a verb of the first person plural in Hiphil, and signifies precisely what it is made to express in our version. What shall we profit, *what profit shall we have*, as in Job xxxv. 3, what *profit shall I have* if I be cleansed from my sin? Job xv. 3. Speeches which can do no good, which *profit him* nothing. The word is of frequent occurrence and with great uniformity of meaning. But it is useless to multiply citations. If the reader is not satisfied, let him examine any respectable critical commentary.

P. Micah v. 2. "But thou Bethlehem Ephrata, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall come forth one that is to be ruler in Israel."

The emendation proposed is to read "*chiefs*" instead of *thousands* of Judah. But this correction cannot be sustained. There is another word, אַלּוּפֵי instead of אַלְפֵי *thousands*, which is rendered *chiefs*, *princes*, *dukes*, &c. Mr. G. charges the translators with copying the Latin and Greek versions, "without archæological knowledge of the Hebrew tongue," whereas they have exactly copied the Hebrew. The same word occurs in the next chapter, Micah vi. 7, "will the Lord be pleased with *thousands* of rams?" and in passages almost without number. Our learned consul says: "We may add, that the reading of CHIEFS is as old as the second century B. C., when the LXX. Greek version was made by the Hellenistic Jews of Alexandria; because about 68, 69, A. D., the author of the 'Good Tidings

according to Matthew,' in citing the above passage from Micah, read 'princes;' and he does not appear to have been acquainted with the Hebrew text." Mr. Gliddon is most unfortunate. The LXX. does not read "chiefs" but "thousands," εν χιλιασιν Ιουδα, agreeing with the Hebrew. Matthew does not quote exactly from either, though the statement that he "does not appear to have been acquainted with the Hebrew text," is assumption.

Q. Isa. xviii. 1, 2. "Wo to the land shadowing with wings."

"All interpreters here have been in fault," but we have it at last from Mr. G., "Ho land of the winged globe!" [Egypt,] the winged globe being "her national symbol." This passage has greatly perplexed commentators, who have offered interpretations of it and paraphrases almost innumerable. It may have perplexed our translators no less than others. A mind of the character of our great "philologer," finds no difficulty in any thing, but men of an order of mind infinitely higher, are still much divided in opinion respecting this passage.

R. Eccles. xi. 2. "Give a portion to seven, and also to *eight;* for thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth."

"Give the measure even to saturity and abundance, because thou knowest not what evil may come upon the earth." *Seven*, it appears, should be *saturity*, and *eight*, *abundance*. There is a word resembling the Hebrew for *seven*, which means *satiety*, *fullness*, but the substitution is entirely gratuitous and unauthorized. To torture the numeral eight שְׁמוֹנָה into a derivative from שֶׁמֶן *oil*, *fatness*, *abundance*, does still greater violence to the text. As the original is, it is literally interpreted in both instances, and in parallel passages of constant occurrence. The charge of error and misunderstanding lies with infinitely greater force against Mr. G., than against the translators.

S. Jer. viii. 7. "The *turtle*, the *crane* and the *swallow*."

"The prophet meant the 'bull,' the 'horse' and the 'colt.'" This *bull* we have in Solomon's Song, in the poetic and delightful description of the return of spring. "Lo the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth, the time of the singing of birds is come; and the voice of the 'bull' is heard in the land." Does not Mr. G. here mean the *bull-frog?* This would be more in harmony with the

context, equally poetic, and quite as true to the original. Compare Psa. lxxiv. 9; Gen. xv. 9, &c.

In the Aramean dialect ת is sometimes found for שׁ, and, in this way, in the Chaldee dialect, the plural of תּוֹר occurs a few times, as in Ezra vi. 9, 17, and Dan. v. 21. But this occurs only in the plural. To give it this meaning in this place, is to do violence to all sound criticism and just lexicography. In the Hebrew, the word סוּס, *crane*, means also, and more frequently *a horse;* the crane is seldom mentioned, the horse often. In this instance then, as in every language, two words having the same orthography, represent objects entirely different. Against Mr. G., not the translators, lies the charge of mistaking the one for the other, as the context distinctly shows that all these are migratory birds that "know their appointed times." Are the *bull*, the *horse* and the *colt* migratory, observing the time of their coming, like the stork in the heavens? Compare again Isa. xxxviii. 14, "Like a *crane* or a *swallow* did I chatter." Think of a man chattering like "a horse" or "a colt." We ask with Mr. Gliddon: "What can be expected of men who translate in this manner?"

T. Zech. v. 1, 2, 3. "I turned and lifted up mine eyes and looked, and behold a flying roll, . . . the length whereof twenty cubits, and the breadth thereof ten cubits. . . . Then he said unto me, This is the curse that goeth forth over the face of the whole earth; for every one that stealeth shall be cut off, as on this side according to it; and every one that sweareth shall be cut off as on that side according to it."

"Think," says our critic, "of a parchment of such proportions actually flying through the air! Consider the *amount of inspiration* it must have required to comprehend which side was mortiferous to thieves, which to swearers." Disposing thus of the usual rendering, he gives us "the sense *verbatim et literatum.*" "And turning myself, I raised my eyes and saw; and behold a *whirling disk* [of fire, having a mystic relation to the Egyptian 'winged globe,' emblem of KHEPER, the *Creator-Sun.*]" To all this mystic exegesis, we have only to say in reply: Think of *writing on* "a whirling disk of fire!" Think of carrying it in one's hand, and finally burning it—*burning a whirling disk of fire!* See Jer. xxxvi. 28, 14, 23, where these very

things are done to the "roll" or "disk." Nay, more, think of *eating* "a whirling disk of fire!" Yet here is the "sense, *verbatim et literatim*," that Ezekiel actually did eat it, and it was in his mouth "as honey for sweetness." Ez. iii. 3. "True which, philologers will recognize as common sense and justness, if as much was not perceived by those wretched theologists, (teologastri,) who, in philological knowledge not surpassing the Hebrew alphabet, go hunting about through lexicons in order thence to spit forth a doctoral decision in people's faces." This extract, Mr. G. quotes with extreme gusto from the papist Lanci, from whom he seems to obtain the bulk of his biblical knowledge, even "the affable Professor (for thirty-nine years) of Sacred Philology at the Roman Vatican." A holy alliance indeed, Gliddon and Lanci!

U. V. Under these heads we have a paraphrase of Ps. xxxvii. 7, and of Ps. cx.; sillier, if possible, than usual. We will quote the former "without note or comment."

"*Senility of the forty-seven*" *translators.* "Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him; fret not thyself because of him who prospereth in his way, because of the man who bringeth wicked devices to pass."

*Gliddon's* "*Amendment.*" "Keep silence in (the secret of) IHOH, and take delight in it: dispute not with him who seeks to penetrate into the acquiring of it, nor with any vain man who attempts it."

Then follows a congratulation, that "a nail has been driven into the forty-seven's version, which we shall have the satisfaction of 'clinching' under the succeeding letters." This "clinching" is effected in this wise:

W. Gen. xxi. 33. "*Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the Lord.*"

"He did nothing of the kind," says Mr. G. "He set up a *tablet* (or *stele*), and *engraved it* with the name of Jehovah." The Jewish rabbis and modern lexicographers understand by the term, a *tamarisk tree*, and collectively, *a grove* of this kind of tree. The word is found in two other passages. 1 Sam. xxii. 6, "Saul abode in Gibeah under *a tree* in Ramah." 1 Sam. xxxi. 13, relating to the burial of Saul and Jonathan. "And they took their bones and buried them under *a tree* in Jabesh."

Such is the meaning of the word, *a tree*, collectively a *wood*, a *grove.*

The word קָרָא *called* on the name of the Lord, occurs near a thousand times in the Bible, with singular uniformity in the same sense as in this passage; in a few passages it means to *call out from a book*, that is *to read;* but in no instance, so far as we have observed, does it mean to *write* or *engrave.* Elijah uses this term when he mocks the priests of Baal, and says, "Cry *aloud*, for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked." 1 Kings xviii. 27.

X. 2 Kings xxiii. 6. "And he brought the grove from the house of the Lord, without Jerusalem, unto the brook Kidron, and burned it at the brook Kidron, and stamped it small to powder."

On this passage we are admonished of "the infamous atrocities of ancient Jewish templar worship," as though these atrocities were authorized acts of the temple service, and not the shocking idolatries which were at times, notwithstanding the severest denunciations, mingled with the worship of the temple. The reference, in this connection, is indeed to these idolatries, from which Josiah purged the temple. The account which Gesenius gives of this word, rendered *grove*, which seems to be the correct idea, is that it denotes "a *statue* or *image* made of wood, as appears from the fact that whenever they are destroyed, they are always said to be *cut down* and *burned*, Ez. xxxiv. 13, Judges vi. 25, and in the chapter under consideration, 2 Kings xxiii. 6, 15, &c. Of the ancient versions some render this word *Astarte;* others, a *wooden pillar;* others, *a tree;* Septuagint very frequently, ἄλσος; Vulgate, *lucus;* Eng. *a grove*, by which they seem to have understood a sacred tree." We do not regard the translators as inspired, but it is truly wonderful how, in the state of biblical learning at that time, they should have been generally so accurate and judicious.

Y. Judges vi. 25, 26, relating to the overthrow of idolatry by Gideon, and the erection of an altar to Jehovah, is passed with a paraphase which requires no special comment. It raises no new point.

Z. Joshua x. 12—14. "Commanding the sun and moon to stand still."

On this passage Mr. G. bestows a "final smile of pity" upon the *forty-seven*. It is sufficient to say, they have given a faithful translation of this passage. The severest thing any body could say of Mr. Gliddon's remarks upon it, would be feeble, compared with the impression which will be made upon the reader by quoting his balderdash, word for word:

"Any proposed verifications of the latitude and longitude of *Gibeon* and *Ajalon* by tourists in modern Palestine, are mere 'traveller's tales;'* for *Gabâ*-On, 'occultation of the sun,' and *Aial*-On, 'dawning of the sun,' refer respectively, the former to the *west*, the latter to the *east*, as points of the compass. Now, suppose two towns, one on either side of a valley, opposite to each other; the one *Gabâ*-On, on the western summit; the other *Aial*-On, on the eastern; while a battle was raging between Israelites and Ammonites in the valley between and beneath. Suppose again, by anticipation of the text, that the twenty-four hours during which this fight went on, occurred at an *equinox;* and that it so happened, by a singular juncture of the solar and lunar motions, that, at six o'clock, P. M., precisely, the sun *set* in the west at the same apparent moment that a full moon rose in the east; you would have light for twenty-four hours in the valley; or twelve hours of sunlight through the day, and twelve hours of moonlight through the night. . . . Finally, in the Hebrew, these two lines are rhythmical, besides containing a play upon the words GBâUN and AILUN, by poetic license:

"To the eyes of Israel, O Sun! in the *hills* [B-GBâUN] even hide thyself:
But thou, O Moon! be most resplendent in the [BâMKAILUN] *valley.*"

What is the use of trying to argue with a man who talks such jabber?

It is useless to take up, one by one, the old sneers and trifling objections to the Bible which have been made a hundred times, and a hundred times answered. Mr. G. seems to feel special pleasure in gathering up the spent balls of such books as the

* It will be remembered that Dr. Robinson discovered their site.

Age of Reason, and of such orators as collect around the Sunday Institute. What a large part of them have to do with "Types of Mankind" we cannot at all see, and we shall not follow them.

In regard to the objection of the uncertainty of the text of Scripture, which Mr. Gliddon parades so ostentatiously for impression upon ignorant men, we quote the following from a recent number of the North American Review. "It seems strange that the text of Shakspeare, which has been in existence less than two hundred and fifty years, should be far more uncertain and corrupt than that of the New Testament, now over eighteen centuries old, during nearly fifteen of which it existed only in manuscript. The industry of collators and commentators indeed has collected a formidable array of 'various readings' in the Greek text of the Scriptures, but the number of those which have any good claim to be received, and which also seriously affect the sense, is so small that they may almost be counted upon the fingers. With perhaps a dozen or twenty exceptions, the text of every verse in the New Testament may be said to be so far settled by the general consent of scholars, that any dispute as to its meaning, must relate rather to the interpretations of the words, than to any doubt respecting the words themselves. But in every one of Shakspeare's thirty-seven plays, there are probably a hundred readings still in dispute, a large proportion of which materially affect the meaning of the passages in which they occur." It may be added, that it is perfectly understood among scholars, that no one doctrine of Scripture of any importance and no practical duty, are at all impugned or materially affected by these "various readings." Nineteen-twentieths of them are of no more importance than the question, whether the words *labor*, *honor*, &c., should be written with or without the additional vowel.

A stronger case even than that of Shakspeare has lately come to the notice of the writer. From a comparison of the manuscript of Edwards' Work on the Will, published within the last century under the superintendence of his own descendants, it may be made apparent that the text is more at variance with the original and more open to objections of this character, than our authorized version itself.

Dr. Johnson long ago remarked, with regard to writing notes on Shakspeare—what applies with equal force to notes like Mr. Gliddon's on the Bible—that the writing of them is no difficult attainment: "The work is performed, first, by railing at the stupidity, negligence, ignorance and asinine tastelessness of the former editors, and showing from all that goes before, and all that follows, the inelegance and absurdity of the old reading; then by proposing something which to superficial readers would seem specious, but which the editors reject with indignation; then by producing the true reading with a long paraphrase, and concluding with loud acclamations on the discovery, and a sober wish for the advancement and prosperity of genuine criticism." If Dr. Johnson had had a prophetic vision of our annotator, could he have given a more accurate description? The "asinine stupidity of the translators," "the absurdity of the old reading," "the true reading," the "long paraphrase," "the loud acclamations," "the sober wish for the advance of archæological deductions and genuine criticism,"—these all indicate the accomplished annotator, according to the prescription of Dr. Johnson.

Our purpose has been to follow Mr. G. in his "conscientious application of enlightened learning to the *Hebrew* text of Xth Genesis," wherein we are admonished that "commentators of the English evangelical school" are "of trivial value in themselves, and possess less weight in science," and that he is provided with "emendations from discoveries made by living Egyptologists, Hebraists, Cuneatic students and similar masters of Oriental lore." Points of great moment, the reader must infer, will "resile to our view" from such awful learning, "with the force of an Euclidian demonstration." Some of these points brought up from the depths of Mr. G.'s "profundities," we will collect for the benefit of the reader, to save him the labor of drabbling through a hundred pages and more of these foul exhumations.

The writer of the Apocalypse was of a "post-Christian and uncertain age, between A. D. 95 and the Council of Laodicea, which rejected it as apocryphal, 360—369, A. D." The prophetic book of Jonah is of an "uncertain but recent age," and is a "mythe," like that of Perseus and Andromeda. "Daniel and the Maccabees are equally canonical in archæology." The

story of the fall of Noah and the curse of Ham, Gen. ix. 20—8, is a "mythe;" and the tenth chap. of Genesis was "written sometime after Joshua, son of Nun, had expelled such Canaanitish tribes as survived massacre." "The fragmentary documents, now called Genesis, were put together at some time, probably Esdraic, two or three centuries before the Christian era." Ethiopia should be rendered in all cases Cush, and designates almost all of Arabia, but never any part of Africa. The last is one of the great achievements of Mr. G.

Arphaxad, the son of Shem and father of Salah, was not a man at all, but a country, the same as Ur of the Chaldees. "There is nothing to constitute Heber an historical personage; but it is the natural appellation of a tribe in southern Arabia, the native country of *Bacchus*, the man with the two horns," and the God of drunkenness. Bacchus, then, will be the father of the patriarch "Heber, of the Abrahamidae or Jokidae."

Respecting the first, second and third chapters of Genesis, the author has pointed out "their Esdraic age, (about B. C. 420,) and the *Persic* origin of some of the mythes they contain." Genesis i—ii: 3, is "an ancient cosmogenical ode with a chorus," which Mr. G. has actually set to music, under the title "Air of the Music of the Spheres." This the reader, "if he be a musician, can play on a piano; if he is a geometrician, he will find its corresponding notes on the sides of an *equilateral triangle* added to the angles of a *square*. We hope to strike the OCTAVE note some day ourselves."

Adam, we are informed, should be rendered "the blusher," and, as none but the *white race* can be said (physiologically) to *blush*, it follows that those Hebrew writers never supposed that Adam and Eve could have been of any stock other than of the *white* type. "Thus, through a few cuts of an archæological scalpel, vanishes the last illusion that any but *white* types of mankind are to be found in the *first three* chapters of the book called Genesis."

O te. Bolane, cerebri
Felicem! * * instat fatum mihi triste, Sabella
Quod puero cecinit, divina mota anus urna:
"Hunc neque dira venena, nec hosticus auferet ensis;
Nec laterum dolor, aut tussis, nec tarda podagra:
*Garrulus* hunc quando consumet cunque.—"

Mr. G. is particularly anxious to prove that the negro race are never mentioned "in the canonical Scriptures, from Genesis to Malachi." Shem, Ham, and Japheth, represent the "yellow," "red" and "white races." To attempt a serious refutation of an assertion that is so utterly at variance with all philological authority, is quite superfluous. Suffice it to say, that according to all respectable philologists the name *Ham* signifies *blackness, heat*, not only in Hebrew, but in all the kindred dialects, with singular uniformity. We have looked somewhat into these authorities, and venture, from many others, to enter in a foot note a few of them, for whom the author professes to entertain profound respect.*

Mr. G.'s history of the Hebrew language is even more extraordinary than his philology. The Hebrew, indeed, is quite a modern language. Abraham "spoke not in Hebrew." The Israelites, "forgetting their mother tongue, adopted afterwards, in Palestine, the speech of Canaan; and calling it Hebrew, unwittingly sanctified the language of the slave. This again was lost in the Babylonish captivity of seventy years, and the *Chaldee* was adopted instead. The present Hebrew alphabet, *the square letter*, was invented some time subsequent to the second century. At the time of our translation, "in 1611, Hebrew had been a dead language for more than two thousand years." "In fact, the Hebrew language may be said only to have been revived within the last century, by modern orientalists."

It really does seem as if Mr. G., in these assertions, has labored to improve upon himself, by showing how far he is capable of outraging all acknowledged facts respecting the Hebrew language. There is a character of whom we are strongly reminded, in the play, who is "intituled, nominated and called Don Adriano de Armado. His humor is lofty, his discourse peremptory, his tongue filed, his eye ambitious, his gait majestical, and his general behaviour thrasonical. He is too picked, too spruce, too affected, too odd, as it were too *perigrinate*, as I may call it."

* Champollion Gram. Egypt. p. 152, 319, seq.; Bunsen's Ægyptens Stelle in den Weltgeschichte, I. S. 612, seq. 598; Champollion, L'Egypte sous les Pharaons, I. p. 101, seq.

Our readers cannot have forgotten the famous opening of the mummy at Boston, so illustrative of the learned Consul's "Egyptological" knowledge. The opening, with its "amusing equivoque of gender," as Mr. Gliddon calls it, is thus described by a popular New York writer:

"The Egyptian princess created one of the periodic fevers of Boston. The enthusiasm of our sister city amounted even to romance, and poets made anticipatory sonnets to the Theban princess. The company was worthy of the interest of the subject. Scientific men, the erudite Agassiz, and the accomplished Bigelow, with a host of others, were proud to lend their aid to the unfolding of that mystery, which, for the time, was to throw into the shade the lectures of a Hudson and the antitheses of a Parker. Day after day, the enlightened assemblage gazed upon the rapidly diminishing envelopes, when it was discovered that the mummy was a man! Dr. Bigelow blushed, and Professor Agassiz put his hands in his pockets."

The researches of Mr. Layard confirm with surprising accuracy the details of Scripture history; results which he devoutly records in the following terms: "I could not doubt that every spadeful of earth which was removed from those vast remains, would tend to confirm the truth of prophecy and to illustrate the meaning of Scripture. But who could have believed that records themselves should have been found, which, as to the minuteness of their details and wonderful accuracy of their statements, should confirm, almost word for word, the very text of Scripture? And remember that these were no fabrications of a later date, in monuments centuries after the deeds which they professed to relate had taken place, but records engraved by those who had actually taken part in them."

These researches and synchronisms of Layard go back eight hundred or a thousand years beyond the Christian era, confirming in each period, by every fresh discovery, the chronology of the Bible. But when now we pass from Assyrian to Egyptian discoveries, Mr. G. finds, in all these, but one single result that accords with the representations of Scripture. It were a pity to deprive our readers of the benefit of a coincidence, at once so remarkable, and so characteristic of the man; but it is of such a character that it cannot be committed to these pages.

These authors repeatedly entertain us with a summation of their results. We beg leave, in imitation of their example, to conclude our Article with a similar summary:

1. This book makes an entirely false impression. With great show of research and ethnological science, it gives us eighteen pages from Agassiz and about thirty from Dr. Morton, which only prove to what extravagances the enthusiasm of men of genius, may carry them. The remainder is stuffed with sceptical "inanities" and impieties, which, under the color of science, are, just so far as received, calculated to unsettle the faith of men in all that is dear to them in the truths, and hopes, and consolations of revealed religion. Its pictures of skulls and Assyrian and Egyptian antiquities, amount to very little, for the main purpose of the book, beyond the expressive word *humbug*.

2. The Second Part of the book, especially, is the production of a mind inflated with the most extraordinary conceit with which any one ever deceived himself into the impression, that he was a man of learning and abilities.

3. As an attack on the Scriptures, the work is at once the most crude, the most impotent, and the most impious of recent times.

4. It has no one element of a work of science; it contains no sound induction, and establishes no reliable principle of ethnology.

5. As a literary production, it has scurrility without wit; pedantry without learning; theory without argument; conclusions without premises, and heartless, revolting scepticism with scarcely a redeeming quality.

We feel sufficiently good-humored to give, at parting, a little advice to the author, from a classic sage, of whom he has no doubt heard, though he may not be able to read him:

> Sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, æquam
> Viribus, et versate diu, quid ferre recusent,
> Quid valeant humeri.

THE

# MAINE LAW ILLUSTRATED:

BEING

## THE RESULT OF AN INVESTIGATION

MADE IN

## THE MAINE LAW STATES;

BY

A. FAREWELL AND G. P. URE,

PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY

OF THE

CANADIAN PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW LEAGUE

DURING THE MONTH OF

**FEBRUARY, 1855.**

---

Toronto:

PRINTED FOR THE CANADIAN PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW LEAGUE;

SOLD FOR THEM BY

J. C. GEIKIE, 70, AND C. FLETCHER, 54, YONGE STREET.

LOVELL & GIBSON, PRINTERS,
CORNER OF YONGE AND MELINDA STREETS,
TORONTO.

TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE

# CANADIAN PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW LEAGUE.

GENTLEMEN,—

Commissioned as we were by you to visit New England, to ascertain the practical effects of the Maine Law in those States in which it had been enacted, we have much pleasure in herewith furnishing an accurate Report of our mission in connexion with that great movement, which is now engrossing the attention of nearly every State in the Union. We listened with an impartial ear to the remarks of friends and foes of the Maine Law, and from all we saw and heard, have no hesitation in declaring, that the virtue, the intelligence, the industry, and the worth, of the New England States, are pledged to a thorough enforcement of that Law, as the only antidote to intemperance,—the prolific source of the vice, the crime, and the pauperism, which afflict Society. The Law has made friends for itself wherever it has been vigorously enforced; and, although evaded in some instances, and violated in others, it is almost universally acknowledged to be as successful in its operations as any other penal law that was ever enacted. Nor has its most vigorous enforcement led, in any one instance that we could ascertain, to the frightful results, so boldly predicted, and pathetically conjured up, by those who were nervously apprehensive that the

sanctity of the domestic hearth would be invaded by the operations of this law. Under no circumstances has the home of the peaceful citizen been more secure, for in this, as in every other case, while the law is a terror to evil-doers, it is a bulwark of strength to them that do well.

To the many kind friends, who so cheerfully aided us in our work, we here respectfully tender our most cordial thanks. As the mere repetition of our acknowledgments, so justly due to each, would, of itself, fill a large space in our Report, we prefer being thus general, and we trust that this, our only reason for not being more specific, will be accepted in good faith by all.

# REPORT.

Left in a measure to take whatever course we deemed best for the successful accomplishment of our mission, we proceeded to Albany, as the New York State Legislature was then in Session, to confer with the Committee who had charge of the new bill prepared to supersede the one vetoed by Governor Seymour, and to ascertain what remedies they had provided for the defects which were felt to exist in the laws passed by other States. We found that a bill much more stringent than the one vetoed by their late Governor had passed its second reading, and had been referred to a committee to report it for final action by the Legislature. This committee was composed of six gentlemen from the majority, and three from the minority of those who had voted upon the bill, viz.: John W. Stebbins, Charles C. Leigh, L. S. May, Levi Miller, N. M. Masters, and C. P. Johnson from the majority, and William B. Aitken, F. S. Dumont, and George H. Searing from the minority.

Mr. Stebbins, the Chairman of the Committee, and one of the most prominent members of the Assembly, very frankly explained to us the position of matters in the Legislature, "Our former law," he said, "was not so well drawn as we could have wished, but the veto put upon it has given us an opportunity to prepare one much more stringent in its provisions. My own experience is, that the laws which have operated best, are those which are the most stringent in their details. Laws which have been drawn in part to please the rum-seller, or the timid temperance man, who wished to make a sort of compromise with the traffic, have failed in their aim, while laws such as that of Connecticut can be enforced successfully. The Michigan Law was well drawn, and being very stringent, the respectable portion of the people made up their minds to obey it, and its immediate effects were very beneficial. It went into operation on the 1st of December, 1853, but having been submitted to the people, it was decided by some of the Courts unconstitutional, in consequence of that submission,

and its enforcement has been retarded. An instance of its success in that State was related to me by a friend who shortly before the passing of the Law travelled through that State about 96 miles by stage. Every few miles there was a tavern at which the stage stopped, that the passengers might get some refreshment. A few months after the law went into operation, he travelled the same route, and every liquor establishment was shut up except one, and not a passenger thought of leaving the stage in quest of liquors.

"In Massachusetts the Courts decided the seizure clause unconstitutional at the very commencement of the operations of the Law, and the liquor sellers who had taken alarm at its threatened enforcement, and left off their peculiar calling, summoned up new courage, and the larger cities were again flooded with liquor. To show that the people have the utmost confidence in the principle of prohibition, not a State that has passed a Maine Law, perfect or imperfect, has by any subsequent popular vote receded from it. More than that, every political party which has dared to array itself against the Maine Law, has been entirely overwhelmed by it. Old Maine, a Democratic State, from time immemorial, put herself in opposition to that law, and her democracy has been entirely crushed.

"Our bill has been referred to a committee to make such amendments as they deem advisable, and from the favor with which it was received by a great majority of the representatives, I have no doubt that our report will be adopted without much discussion. I shall have pleasure in introducing you to Mr. Aitken, who has drawn up a report from the minority of the committee against the law. He will be able to tell you for himself the grounds of his opposition. This one thing I wish the friends of Temperance in Canada to keep before their minds,—Let them endeavor to get a Law as stringent as it can be made, but at the same time as simple as possible. We cannot deal with the transit from one State to another, and we do not attempt to interfere with the manufacturer. What we aim at is to prohibit the sale, and the giving away, of liquors by any person, except for mechanical or medicinal purposes, and for these purposes we do not allow it to be kept anywhere unless in one of the places appointed as the agency of the locality. In a private dwelling house, or during transit from one State to another, or while stored for transit, we do not wish to exert any control, and any family may have in their house whatever quantity of liquors they may choose, unless they attach a store or grocery to such dwelling house. Whatever is kept for sale as a beverage is declared contraband, and if discovered will be destroyed.

"The majority of the Committee to which was referred so much of the Governor's Message as related to the subject of intemperance and

the sale of intoxicating liquors, introduced the present bill, accompanied with a brief report on the principle of prohibition. We stated, to the effect, that we entirely concurred with the Governor in his views as expressed in that portion of his Message referred to us. We are also satisfied that the time has arrived when sound and wholesome legislation, which shall effectually put a stop to the sale and public use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, is demanded alike by the voice of the people and the highest interests of the State After referring to various opinions given regarding the immorality of the traffic in ardent spirits, the committee say, 'we are aware the bill now submitted, although prepared with much care, has imperfections, for all human laws are imperfect. We are aware, too, that its imperfections, viewed through the colored medium of self-interest, will be magnified and distorted if possible into hideous spectral forms to stalk the State and terrify the people, yet we confidently believe that should the bill we submit become a law, it will prove effectual in suppressing by much the larger proportion of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. We have called to our aid the experience of the past, and some of the ablest in legal ability, and wisest in practical knowledge. Nor have we been unmindful of the opinions of the opponents of prohibition. Those we have received and carefully weighed, and in the light of all sought to frame a bill, not unnecessarily stringent in its provisions, and yet sufficiently so to secure obedience, and accomplish the great end in view. To aim at less than this would be folly, to seek more, tyranny.'"

Having had a little conversation of a general nature with Mr Stebbins, he resumed his seat in the Assembly, as he was at that sitting to move the postponement of the Report of the Committee, on the Orders of the day, until the end of the following week. He proposed his motion, but unfortunately it was so close upon the hour of adjournment, that we were deprived of what threatened to be a very fiery speech in opposition to the bill.

Mr. O'Keefe, one of the representatives for the city of New York, rose to speak to Mr. Stebbins' motion. He said, "The motion now submitted was simply to the effect that those gentlemen, the majority of the representatives on the floor of this House, would grant to you, the minority, the helpless, miserable minority on this temperance question, the glorious privilege of discussing the subject. We wish to shew you how magnanimous we are to give you such a privilege. But so far as I am concerned I ask no concessions from them whatever. If they are determined by force and by ingenuity to cram down the throats of the minority, this most infamous bill, then in God Almighty's name, let them do it. I only ask" [here the

Speaker's hammer checked the torrent that was about to burst, and the House was declared adjourned,] a circumstance which we very much regretted.

After the adjournment we had an interview with Mr. Aitken, but could not learn much from him in a tangible form in regard to his opposition to the bill. He, however, kindly furnished us with several documents on the question, one of which was a copy of a report, which he, as the chairman of the opposition committee, had submitted to the House. This report, he stated, contained the grounds of his opposition, and might be used by us as if drawn up in answer to our enquiries.

After an allusion to the vetoed Bill, the committee proceed to review the Bill now before the House, and they say,

"But while the undersigned acknowledge in the altered language of the bill and its subtle modifications, a concession to public opinion and a desire not directly to confront and assail the Constitution, they recognize in the bill the same intrinsic errors, and the same dangerous consequences that distinguished the condemned and repudiated bill of 1854. The same summary processes are authorized, the same dictation and perversion of evidence, the same trifling with the obligations of contracts, the same endowment of the lowest class of magistracy with arbitrary powers, the same tampering with the right of jury trial, and the same subornation of informers and prosecutors. The theory of absolute prohibition is retained, while the right of search is ostensibly more guarded, when conducted upon the warrant of a magistrate, yet section twenty-five of the act which declares that 'all liquor kept in violation of any provision or provisions of this Act, shall be deemed and is hereby declared to be a public nuisance,' re-opens the door for still more fearful abuses. The undersigned cannot but believe that the philanthropic men under whose superintendence this measure has been brought forward, were ignorant of the purport and of the scope of this sweeping clause. It breaks down all the guards which protect property and the privacy of dwellings and individual rights, and gives up the privilege of search and seizure, and destruction of property to the arbitrary will and unregulated violence of a mob. * * * Much misunderstanding of the relation of the State to the business of the people has grown out of the term 'license,' which is used to define a pecuniary fine or tax, but which in its more general acceptation signifies a special permission and approval granted by a superior to an inferior. 'The several statutes which authorize the issuing of licenses to auctioneers, pedlars, victuallers, pawnbrokers, cart and hackmen, and the exhibitors of public shows, do not intend to imply that the class of dealings which

these persons pursue is injurious to the public welfare, or that the State, by licensing them, connects itself with them or becomes morally, or in any way responsible for them. The 'license' is intended, first, as a tax imposed in a mode easily collectable; and second, as a method of remuneration and identification which greatly facilitates the operations of police. The tax contributed from these sources is large, and cannot well be dispensed with, now that the pressure of municipal, county and State taxes has been so largely increased. The bill reported to your House, however, does acknowledge the principle, and establish the practice of 'licenses' in the more obnoxious meaning of the term. It first outlaws the traffic in spirits, wines and ales, and provides sweeping processes against all engaged in it, and summary modes of executing them by search, seizure, confiscation, fine and imprisonment; and then it authorizes two thousand persons to be specially appointed to deal in liquor, without fees, tax or reward. The parties who appoint them are the Judges of the Courts, and the qualification for the office is an affidavit that the applicant does not use intoxicating liquor as a beverage, and will not infringe the limitations of the law. These limitations are, that he shall sell such liquor only for mechanical, chemical and medicinal purposes, and pure wine for sacramental use; and it is enacted that the seller must have good reason to believe, and must believe, that the same are purchased with the intent to be used for one of the purposes mentioned. How far the law can be enforced, which declares that one man shall believe in the intention of another, or that the other shall do as he intended, is a question which has never yet been practically solved. * * The provisions of this Act will have the effect of bringing before the Courts the question not only of what is a medical use of wines, &c., but what is a Sacrament, and what are its characteristics and its limitations. The undersigned cannot conceal how deeply they deprecate a result, which, by bringing in the tribunals of State as interpreters of the Word of God, has always in other lands and under less favoured governments, where it has been attempted, proved equally disastrous to religion and to liberty. * * It is also to be noticed that in this bill all the provisions are so contrived to work together, as to discriminate against certain classes of society, and to interpose barriers against the poor and humble, which the rich are afforded facilities to overleap. The barrel of cider is not prohibited, though the single glass is. The wine grower may raise his own wines, and sell them to the authorized purchasers. The epicure in foreign liquors may import brandies and rare old wines from abroad, in the original package. The owner or renter of a single dwelling may revel in the possession of an unlimited supply of intoxicating drink, while

the citizens who live in houses, which in part are occupied as stores, offices, or work-rooms, &c., are not legally permitted to retain in their houses the smallest quantity of any admixture of the liquors prohibited by the Act. * * It may be regarded as one of the peculiarities of modern legislation on this subject, that this law, after declaring an article of nearly universal consumption for centuries, "a nuisance," yet makes special provision for its use as a sacrament of religion, and connives at the means by which the so-called better class of society shall have the freest access to it! Such characteristics of a law are not calculated to conciliate towards it that respect and that loyal obedience which a republican people should at all times extend to laws passed by their representatives."

"These are the main features of a bill which, in many other respects, especially in its attempts to regulate the transportation of goods between States, and to obstruct the reception of imported goods, conflicts not only with the laws of trade and the rights of citizens, but with the provisions of the United States Constitution. These arbitrary provisions; this seizure of property; this search of houses; this perversion of evidence; this disorganization of the jury; are, perhaps, necessary steps to enforce the provisions of the law, which assumes to prohibit, absolutely, a traffic not forbidden by religion, and in itself not injurious to public morals, or the well-being of society. * * * In a republican system, the introduction of force is always more dangerous, because the theory of such government rests upon the assumption of man's capacity for self-government and its administration should always be directed to the elevation of the citizen to his true dignity, by education; by the amelioration of his condition; and by the guarantee of his individual liberty of action.

The efforts of the teachers of temperance, by moral suasion, to lead men to abstinence from intoxicating drinks, directed as they were in appeals to the intellects and the hearts of men, had more success than any teachings not of divine inspiration. The customs and habits of society were changed. The influence of woman was brought to aid in the discountenance of intoxicating drinks. Liquors were excluded from the family board, and temperate fathers inculcated the virtue of self-restraint to their children. The example of such a reform, founded upon the judgment of men and their moral and religious convictions, gave evidence of a race of sturdy-minded people. It was a part of their intellectual training, which promised the most gratifying developement. It was most unfortunate that this system of persuasion to virtue and prudence, was ever abandoned for statutory restraints. Thus far the practical consequences of the change have been, that the efforts of good men to resist the spread of habits of

vicious indulgence have been relaxed, and the evil has become of wider influence. It is to be feared that the transfer of this moral question into the hands of the sheriffs and constabulary and police of the State, will, without effecting its end, tend indirectly to degrade the cause of temperance and discourage its true friends, by identifying it with the idea of violence and coercion, and staining it with the suspicion of hostility to individua freedom!"

On the day following this interview with the gentlemen named, we had the pleasure of attending a caucus meeting of upwards of fifty members of the Legislature, friendly to the bill, and met to discuss its various provisions in order to avoid discussion, when it came to be reported by the Committee. We spent from four to five hours very agreeably in that caucus. They differed now and again upon the phraseology of some of the sections of the bill, but all united in one harmonious declaration of adhesion to the principle of prohibition, —and that the traffic in intoxicating liquors is a crime against society. We spent a short time with O. Scovill, Esq., the publisher of the "Prohibitionist," and received from him several documents connected with the movement, and also an outline of its progress in the several States.

## SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

From Albany we proceeded to Springfield, Massachusetts, which we reached on Saturday evening about 8 o'clock. In the cars from Albany we met with the Hon. H. W. Bishop, Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, Massachusetts, on his way to Boston, to open his term in that neighbourhood. As every opportunity of gaining information of the Law was turned to account, we soon fell into conversation on that question, with Judge Bishop. His answers to our preliminary enquiries were:—

The criminal business has very much increased under the new Law. It is accounted for in this way: the violations of the Law itself add, very materially, to the criminal business. I had, in my last term in the County of Middlesex, no fewer than 104 indictments under the new Law; I should think that five-sixths of the whole were convicted. The operation of this new Law has diminished the other class of criminal business very much. It is accounted for in this way: the majority of other criminal business proceeded from intemperance. I say, without fear of contradiction, that nine-tenths of all crimes of personal violence—assaults in their various forms,—are committed in a state of intoxication. Crimes of personal violence have hitherto constituted, at least, two-thirds of all our criminal business, and if the source of the evil is dried up by this new Law, it is easy to see that

Judges, by and by, will have very little criminal business to attend to."

"As regards the Law itself, I am not sure that the temperance people acted wisely in bringing forward a new Law. Had they added two or three sections to the old Law of 1836, giving the right of search and seizure, and making the instruments of sale *prima facie* evidence in certain cases, so as not to interfere with Common Law precedent they would have acted more judiciously. For this reason: the old law was thoroughly construed in every word, and the Courts were satisfied as to its meaning, but several years will pass before the Courts are satisfied as to the bearing of this new law, and quibbles and objections will constantly be raised against it."

On Monday morning we waited upon Dr. Holland, Editor of the Springfield *Republican*, and having opened to him the purport of our visit, he pointed out some of the difficulties which they had to encounter in enforcing the Law in Springfield, but expressed his firm conviction that its operations would be highly beneficial to society. Accompanied by Dr. Holland we called upon the Rev. Mr. Seeley, who entered very warmly into the spirit of our mission, and urged us to prosecute it with energy, as the more narrowly we enquired into the workings of the Maine law, the more fully would we be assured that it had already gained the favour of all whose opinion or influence was worth having. We had prepared a series of questions to cover pretty much the field of enquiry regarding the Law, and having put several of these to Mr. Seeley, we received the following answers, which we give as nearly as may be in the Rev. gentleman's own words:

"The Maine Law has not operated so well in Springfield during the past year, because our local authorities, apparently, have not been disposed to enforce it. When the Law first went into operation, its beneficial effects were very remarkable indeed. It evidently made a very great change in the moral aspect of the entire city. Within the past year, the sale of liquors has increased again. After the decision of the Supreme Court against the seizure clause, the rum-seller has become emboldened, and the friends of temperance have been somewhat discouraged; and the rowdyism and noise which liquor produces, although nothing like what it was formerly, has increased amongst a certain class of our population of late. We have recently elected a new city government, and they are determined to maintain the supremacy of the Law. The present law, imperfect as it is in some of its provisions, will work well, and our new local authorities are disposed to enforce it; and I am convinced there will be no great difficulty in doing so. It is a law well adapted to gain favour among

the people when once thoroughly established. I have no doubt that its effects will be to supersede almost entirely the use of liquors among our people. I have witnessed its favourable effects upon many working people connected with my own congregation. I could mention several instances. One very interesting case came to my knowledge very recently. In making my accustomed rounds, I called at a house, which formerly presented rather a distressing appearance. I was astonished at the wonderful reform which had taken place, and suspecting the cause, I expressed the pleasure I felt at the happy change, when the good woman said, with an overflowing heart, in something like the following words: 'All this is the effect of the Maine law! My husband was not a drunkard, and would not drink for the mere love of drinking; but he was very sociable; and when he went in of a Saturday evening with his companions into the tavern, he would sometimes spend all his wages and come home intoxicated! But he now comes home sober—the temptation is removed out of his way, and he has provided for us all very comfortably ever since the Maine Law was put in operation. We have got a new carpet to our room; and he purchased this little singing canary bird for our little boy, who has begun to attend the Sunday School.'

"Many such instances could be given of the very happy effects of the Law, and I think it will thus ensure its own perpetuity when once fairly established.

"Its effects are very marked upon our young men. Since the fashionable saloons were shut up, they have formed a Young Men's Literary Association, where they meet regularly to read essays, and for general mutual improvement. Our Lyceum lectures were never half so well attended as they have been this winter. In addition to our usual lectures two or three evenings a week, we have recently had two courses, of six lectures each, on Geology, by Dr. Boynton, and they were thronged every evening. The first course was so crowded that he was prevailed upon to give a second, that those who had not heard him might have an opportunity of doing so; and our hall, capable of containing one thousand people, was crowded all the evenings. You saw there precisely the same class of people, that in Montreal you will see at the theatre."

"Our young men now feel that a ticket to the Lyceum lectures is an absolute necessary of life. This feeling has increased so much that we have no building large enough to contain the applicants. I believe that three thousand tickets could have been sold as easily as one thousand. To meet so far the demand, an extra course is intended to

be given on a different evening for those who could not get tickets for the regular course.

"Most of our drinking places were kept by foreigners,—the lowest class of Irish emigrants,—before the law went into operation. These people come here with all their vicious habits confirmed, and it is almost impossible to check them. How many of these houses were open, I cannot say, but there is no open house now; although it is sold secretly by that class, who have it concealed in their shanties.

"This is a contest between moral sentiment and self-interest, but you will find as you proceed, that a sound, healthy public sentiment, not only in those States where the Law has passed, but in the States where it is in agitation, is decidedly in favour of a prohibitory law. It is not expected that persons resolutely bent on drinking will not get liquor. The great point aimed at is to destroy the dram-drinking, and declare the traffic contraband. This done, the battle is won. One instance of the power of public sentiment you may relate if you please. The Messrs. Chapin, the proprietors of the Massasoit House, where you are now staying, had a lower establishment in the ground floor of their hotel, where they sold meals at half price; here also they sold liquors of all sorts. But when the Maine law went into operation, they banished that part of their establishment, and with it about three thousand dollars of yearly profits.

"Your last question I answer without hesitation. I think the Maine law is the ripened fruit of the Temperance Reformation. What has been done hitherto has gradually led us up to this point, and I have no doubt whatever we will be sustained by the people."

Accompanied by Mr. Seeley we called upon the Rev. H. B. Ide, D. D. His answers to many of our questions were similar in spirit to those already given. "It strikes me" said the Dr., "that the law is especially beneficial on the rural population. There is a difficulty in enforcing the Law in large cities,—a difficulty in getting a moral sentiment in cities and large towns so sufficiently high as to enforce it. When once the law is amended in some of its provisions, I have no doubt it will thoroughly destroy the vice of intemperance. Our late city government do not seem to have been in favour of enforcing the law; but we expect something better from our new government.

"An interesting instance of the efficacy of the Law came under my own observation, one year ago last summer. I was in Boothbay, a small sea port town of some 3,000 inhabitants, in the State of Maine, where, at certain periods of the year, immense fleets of mackerel fishers come with their boats, sometimes from 300 to 400 at a time. One Sunday morning I was passing by the head of the pier where about 300 of these fishermen were seated. Everything was perfectly quiet

as I passed by. Some had out their bibles and were reading. As I passed one group I said, "Had you not better go to church shipmates? Some remarks were made, and simultaneously they all rose and accompanied me to the church where I intended to preach that morning. The scene was so very gratifying that I could not help saying to the landlord of the hotel that he must have a curious class of fishermen in that quarter. 'Ah!' said he, 'if you had been here before the Maine law passed, you would, on such a day as this, have seen these rocks all along covered with blood. No female dared venture out of the house at such a time. I opposed the law with all my might, because I thought it was going to injure my trade; but now I make much more money when these men are on shore than I did by supplying them with liquor. When they go away they take with them whole canoe loads of eggs and hams, and other necessaries.

"That Sunday I assure you was as orderly as any Sunday could be; and there was not a bottle to be seen in the whole company when they left in the evening, but one bottle of vinegar.

"I cannot say that I have known any change upon my own congregation since the passing of the Law. Our people have been pretty well drilled into temperance for many years past, so that in a congregational way it is not new to them. The public sentiment in favour of temperance is here so high that it is marked as an offence for any one either to sell or drink spirits; whereas in olden times every deacon and nearly every Pastor too, could keep his side-board well filled and no one thought it wrong. Now if the veriest loafer is seen drunk in the streets, it strikes the community with horror."

Accompanied by Mr. Seeley we called upon Messrs Chapman and Chamberlain, Counsellors at Law, gentlemen of high standing in the community.

In answer to some enquiries as to the working of the Maine Law, Mr. Chapman said: "There is not the one-hundredth part of the drinking in Springfield, that there was before the temperance movement commenced. You will however find persons even here, who will tell you that prohibitory laws will increase drinking. But those who say so are invariably persons, who desire to sell, and commonly the lowest dealers; or persons who are hard drinkers; or politicians who court the rumseller's vote and influence and pander to them for it. The religious and moral part of the community, without exception, you will find of a contrary opinion. Even those who in their own families use their wine give their influence in favour of the Maine Law. After seeing the effects of the Maine Law the public sentiment of this country has got to be such, that it is now certain that within a short time a law embodying the substance of the Maine Law, with

perhaps some variation in its details, will become the law of every State in the Union. It is in fact destined to be *the law* of this country. I am convinced there is no reaction in the public mind. The feeling of the community is stronger to-day than it was a year ago, and it was stronger a year ago than it was two years since. That such laws are necessary is evident by observing their beneficial operations upon the jails and poor houses, and their reformatory effects upon society generally. They diminish vastly the amount of crime and vice of every description.

"That class of crimes against the person, to which you refer, assaults in their various forms, were almost always committed under the influence of drink, and already that class of crimes has nearly ceased.

"There is another feature in the character which the working of the Maine Law has brought out. Those who are mean enough to purchase or sell liquor in violation of the law, will not scruple to perjure themselves to escape the penalty. The Judges in our criminal courts, all express their abhorrence, that those who are called as witnesses to the purchase of liquor, will as a general thing commit perjury, and deny all knowledge of the purchase, and those who sell will countenance and encourage and even hire such gross perjurers to screen themselves from the penalty of the law. Judge Hoare told me recently that down in Worcester county, a very respectable man was known to come out of a hotel a little affected with drink,—The hotel keeper was brought up for selling, and this man when called to testify, swore that he had not purchased any kind of liquor there for several months past. They called up the bar-keeper and asked if he ever sold liquor to that man. He said—Yes, I have sold liquor to him every day for some time past.

"This is an evil we have to contend against at present, but it will work its own cure.

"We shall be greatly aided by the passing of the law in the neighbouring state of New York, as then there will be more difficulty in obtaining liquor. I think the effects of the law in Berkshire county where I have witnessed its operations personally, are similar to those manifested here. The law is even more popular there than here and is more fully enforced.

I concur in the opinion which you say was expressed by Judge Bishop that three or four new sections engrafted upon our old law of 1836 would have been as useful to us as the new law. That old law of '36 was so thoroughly understood in the courts that no difficulty could have been felt in carrying it out. No man was more thoroughly acquainted with the old law than Judge Bishop, for while a Counsellor he defended more prosecutions for its violation than perhaps any other

man in the State, and now he has fully studied the other side by enforcing it as a Judge."

"An instance of the traffic in liquors came before me very recently. One of the members of the firm of Trull & Co., distillers, Boston, while giving evidence in regard to some railroad crossing that was obstructing their business, incidentally stated, as of itself showing the extent of their trade, that they had a contract with one house in Constantinople, for 150,000 gallons of new rum a month, and that that house sold it to the French Commissariat."

"At a recent meeting of the Berkshire County Temperance Society, H. L. Dawes, of North Adams, the present State's Attorney of this District, stated that at the time the law was passed he had no faith in it, that he proposed a substitute which the rum-sellers had ever since applauded; that he gave the law a reluctant vote because he was convinced the people would not be satisfied until they had tried the Maine Law. The law passed, and he resolved to give it a fair trial, and he had come that evening to give his full testimony in its favour. It had worked well where it had been fairly tried. It had shown the integrity of the jury box. He had yet to find a jury who had hesitated to convict under clear evidence. Prohibition has now become a settled principle, and the Law a part of our criminal code. Public sentiment places rum-selling with other crimes, and its criminals with other criminals. There is no way but to go forward steadily and firmly. Spasmodic efforts would not do it. Sleepless vigilance alone would suffice. Legal and moral agencies should be combined. They are like the soul and body, and in the present state of existence cannot well act separately."

We visited the establishment of the Messrs Merriam extensive publishers, and received from both gentlemen an unhesitating testimony in favor of the Law. "When the authorities," they said, "undertook to carry out the law it was obvious to every unprejudiced mind that it worked well, and there was little difficulty in carrying it out until the seizure clause was pronounced unconstitutional. We have sometimes been very much disappointed by having our work delayed in consequence of the workmen drinking, but we have not been annoyed with that of late. There is no doubt that its effects upon the working classes will be highly beneficial."

Mr. Police Justice Morton of Springfield said, "The law has not yet had a fair trial with us. There was a question came before the Superior Courts as to whether the Police Courts had Jurisdiction, and the Police Justices had direct information from the Judges not to try a case until this question was decided. In December 1853 the issue was determined; but during all the fol-

lowing year, 1854 we had a city government opposed to enforcing the law. The case is different now, but as yet we have no fair criterion of the beneficial operations of the law, especially amongst that degraded class who seem to set all law at defiance. It is a fact that the city is much more quiet than it used to be. Those opposed to the law say that this result is owing entirely to the change in the city authorities and not to the law. Public sentiment throughout the city is in favour of the enforcement of the law. There are a number of old fusion politicians, opposed to it in sentiment, but even their prejudices are fast wearing away. In regard to the trials, I would say that a large proportion of all the witnesses that have appeared before me, I am satisfied, have committed perjury and did it with a view to clear the parties engaged in the sale of intoxicating liquor. The police books will give no correct information at present in regard to the working of the law, because persons now seen intoxicated are arrested, which was not the case before, and persons who sell in violation of the law are brought up to the police court for trial. In this way the criminal business appears to have considerably increased under the new law, but as the other class of offences which formerly constituted the chief business in the police court, has almost entirely disappeared, this new class will soon be worked out. It is a certain fact that nearly all the cases, 45 in number, brought before me during the past month, January 1855, have been under the new law, either for drunkenness or for selling liquor."

Mr. Brannan, City Marshall, Springfield. "You will find that wherever our law is enforced it works well. I have passed through several States during the past year where the law is in operation and from my own experience I can state that there is no class of men, as a class opposed to the law unless those engaged in the traffic. Even parties who never had any connexion with the temperance movement are now convinced that the enforcement of the law will be very beneficial to the best interests of the community."

Hon. E. Trask, Mayor, Springfield. "Here the law has not been carried out so effectively as we could have wished, but so far as it has been carried out its effects upon the city have been very beneficial. I am not aware that it has made much difference upon my own establishment. For the last 20 years I have adhered to the principle of keeping no man about me addicted to drinking. I have paid my men weekly for the last 14 or 15 years, and whenever any signs of drinking appeared, I parted with the man at once, no matter though he was the best workman I had. The large businesses here have been conducted pretty much upon the temperance principle. I have men with me now, who have been with me for the last twelve years at least. I am

convinced that the public sentiment of this city is every day becoming stronger in favor of the Maine Law."

We visited the Armoury, an extensive establishment, on the hill overlooking the town, and known familiarly as "Uncle Sam's House." Here we found upwards of 150 men busy at work making fire-arms for the nation. The whole work is carried on, on strictly temperance principles and no liquor of any kind is ever admitted. All was cleanly and comfortable looking. The men all work by the piece, but are close and regular in their attendance, and few if any use intoxicating liquors at all, even when beyond Sam's massive gates.

## HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT.

From Springfield we proceeded to Hartford, Connecticut. On the following morning we joined several gentlemen in the parlour of the hotel discussing some statistics which had appeared in that morning's Hartford *Times*. These statistics purported to be the commitments to the Hartford jail, for drunkenness from 1850 to 1854 inclusive, shewing that drunkenness was very greatly on the increase. We had not yet seen the morning paper, but the statistics were pronounced by nearly all the gentlemen present to be a mere *ex-parte ruse* for a political purpose. In answer to some enquiries put to H. Y. Phelps, Esq., of New York, he said: "I have lived now more than 60 years in the world, and from observation and experience I am convinced that 95 per cent. of all the evils which afflict society are caused by rum and intemperance. Talk about invasion of rights by the Maine law!—Intemperance invades ten thousand times more rights than ever the Maine law could do. I do think it is tasking one's credulity too much to parade these statistics before him. They are utterly and entirely fallacious. The man who says that the Maine Law has produced more drunkenness amongst the people, says what is utterly false, and knows it to be false at the time he says so. I have no doubt that Governor Dutton's speech on this subject is true to the very letter. Prior to the passing of the Law, I have seen people rolling drunk through the streets,—for we have as bad a population here as in the city of New York. But the quarrelling, and fighting, and rioting which were before so common, have entirely disappeared. I have resided here some years, although I am not a voter in this State. I give you my opinion as an onlooker. The Law has not entirely relieved the city from drunkenness, but it has diminished it. The genteel drinker can drink at home, and there are many violations of the Law, but the open drinking is entirely stopped."

Rev'd. Dr. Clarke, of Hartford, said: "The Law is creating friends for itself every day here. It is more easily executed now than it was at first. The general effects produced are all good. The good people of Connecticut would no more consent to go back to their old License laws, than they would consent to repeal the laws against gambling, counterfeiting, or murder. One remarkable feature of our Connecticut law is, we can enforce it in this city against its most respectable violators. We have frequent violations, but the parties are speedily snatched up. The good fruits of the Law are very apparent in connexion with the labours of our city mission. There is no sensible man, unless he has some private reason for deceiving himself, will say that the Law has produced more drunkenness than there was before it went into operation."

Accompanied by Dr. Clarke we called upon the Hon. T. S. Williams, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Conn., a benevolent, hale looking old gentleman, 75 years of age, who had the honour of drawing up the Connecticut Law. In answer to our enquiries regarding its operation, and to its producing more drunkenness, the Judge said: "I cannot imagine there is any foundation for such remarks. I have no hesitation in saying that the accounts these people give are entirely erroneous; they either make them for a political purpose, or pick them up from people who are entirely inimical to the operations of the law. The *Times* newspaper here, for example, has taken up an opposition to the law, as a political movement. They say there is more intemperance now than there was before. But I see there is no ground for the assertion, but this,—there are more prosecutions for drunkenness than there were. The fact is, that under the old Law persons who were in the streets drunk were paid no notice to. I have seen it myself frequently. The practice was growing very bad amongst us. Since the 1st of August last (when our Law went into operation,) I have not seen more than one or two instances of intemperance in the streets. The instances are now, indeed, rare. The quiet in our city is altogether undisturbed. I live in a place in town where I have frequently heard persons pass who, from their conversation, it was evident, had been drinking. Since the 1st of August I have seldom heard any such language. Our streets are now comparatively quiet. I have no doubt that the effect in this city has been exceedingly good. If drinkers go to the liquor shops,—and I believe some of them go yet,—they are particularly careful to come away before they are so tipsy as to make a noise in the streets. To say that there is as much drinking now as there was, is to assert an impossibility—because the houses are nearly all given up; and those who do sell must do it in darkness. There are, however, several par-

ties who have formed clubs in the city, and they get their liquors from New York. These parties may, perhaps, drink more freely than before, but that is but a small part of the drinkiug which we had to contend against. A dozen of men, say, join together and form a club, they send to New York for a supply of liquor to their club-room, and then they may drink freely ; but if a club-room-man is found drunk in the streets, he is immediately proceeded against, and fined in $20 and costs. This, so far as I can learn, is the only foundation for the remark regarding the increase of drinking. But these club-men form but a small part of the community. One of these club-room-men was taken up in the streets drunk recently: he acknowledged before the Justice of the Peace where he got his drink, and paid his fine. If a person found drunk says he got his liquor at such and such a store, then the owner of the store is prosecuted for the sale :—But if he says he got it in a club-room, he pays the fine himself, or is committed in default. All the drinking places are shut up. Now and again, however, in the recesses of some private den, concealed with trap doors, and all that sort of thing, it is sold. But it is only in this secret manner that the thing can be done; just the same as if the parties were making counterfeit money, or doing any other illegal act. The very fact that it must be sold illegally, if sold at all, will prevent many a one from going in who otherwise would."

"Every person of good moral character who, in former times, applied for a license, might, at the discretion of the select men, be licensed. It was more a matter of form than anything else. I presume there were as many as 200 shops in this city where liquor was openly sold before the passing of the law. These houses have all given up the open sale ; if any still sell it must be in secret."

" In regard to the Law, I think we must have some clause to attach the liquor in club-rooms. We must also have a clause to attach common carriers, and such like persons from carrying it. While it remains in the hands of the importer, and with the mark of the importer on it, it is protected by the Constitution of the United States. But my impression is that as soon as it is broken up, that constitutional question ceases."

" So far as I can learn, the law is gaining in the affections of the people, and if we could separate it from politics, two-thirds, at least, of the people of Connecticut would at once come out in favour of it. But it is so mixed up with political matters that many men who love politics better than they love their children, will vote for a particular man who takes up some political measure strongly, even though he is opposed to this law. Here the leading Democratic papers, without exception almost, have taken active ground against the law. The

object is transparent. As the Law was passed by the Whigs, they would fain bring discredit upon it, in order to get the party injured. In this city however, the *Times*, the Democratic organ, is even more hostile than either prudence or his party would dictate; and there is a talk of starting a more respectable Democratic organ, which I have no doubt will be effected."

Mr. Judge Bulkeley, of Hartford, said: "The rumours to which you allude are, in my opinion, without foundation. It is true there are many more commitments for drunkenness now than there was formerly. Why? Because under the former law there were no prosecutions, comparatively speaking, for drunkenness, and no one was committed for drunkenness simply, or unless there was some offence committed while drunk. But there is much less drunkenness; much less intemperance; much less liquor sold now. It is not sold openly at all, but is driven into secret places."

"I think there can be no controversy that the community have been essentially benefitted by the Law. The number of misdemeanors is far less. We are not rid of them altogether, and do not expect to be, but the city is much more quiet, both by day and night. The increase in the number of criminal actions has all been, or nearly all, in consequence of violations of this new Law.

"It was only in the grosser kinds of cases where an officer stumbled upon a man drunk, that he felt compelled to take any notice of it. Now wherever a man is seen drunk he is taken up. I was not very zealous to have such a law. I stood rather for the enforcement of the old law; but the community were desirous to have the law, and I, and others who joined in with them to give it a trial, see now its wholesome and beneficial results. So high was the state of feeling in favour of the law, that in our town-meeting last November, for the choice of select men, seven men were elected, every one of whom was in favour of enforcing the law; and elected not by a meagre majority, but almost two to one. Native Americans, Whigs, and Temperance men, all voted together, opposed chiefly by the Democratic party."

Mr. Benning Mann, Counsellor at Law, City Police Clerk. "I have been Police Justice here for the last 20 years, and I know a very great difference since this law went into operation. I think that when the people become tired of selling in violation of the law, my occupation will be pretty nearly gone. If you stop drinking you stop the cause of all the quarrels and fights. It is perfect nonsense,—it is a perfect falsehood, to say that the law has increased drunkenness. That drinking is totally stopped, nobody claims; but it is stopped at least three-fourths. I have known some of our constables here have as high as $90 in a quarter for fines for breaches of the peace; if they reach $25

now it is the head. The parties brought before the police court will average eight out of ten Irish. The Irish are our only foreign population, with a few Germans.

L. S. Cowles—I have been a policeman here since the 1st of May, 1854. I have seen ten men drunk on the streets before this law passed for one that I have seen since. These men, although they would have been liable for prosecution under the new law, were not taken up under the old law. It was only when a drunken man was making some assault that he was taken up formerly. On one Sunday, before the law was passed, I arrested seven men for breaches of the peace while in drink. Since the 1st of August, I have only arrested two men on Sunday for being drunk. There are eight night watchmen, and seldom a night passed without some man being taken up by them for beating his wife or children while in a state of intoxication. Now it is a rare thing to take up one. This law has taken, at least, $6 a month right out of my pocket, for we have no fines now. It would be almost impossible to make any one believe the difference in the quiet of our city."

David Hawley, City Missionary, Hartford—"I have been in the field as City Missionary for three years and a half. I have a Mission Sabbath School, established after the Five Points School of New York. Since the first of August, it has increased more than one-third in numbers. Before that time there was hardly a Sabbath but there was some one there the worse for liquor. Since the 1st of August there has been but one instance that even the smell of liquor was in the school. Before the law passed, I could, many a day have gathered up a waggon load of intemperate men, almost indeed, any day: since the 1st of August I have seldom met with an instance. I have many times seen, in passing my rounds, wives and mothers, and even young women the worse for liquor; but all that has changed, and in my conversations with the poor people, many of them say that the law must have come from Heaven—it is too good to have been framed by man. The little children that used to run and hide from their fathers when they came home drunk, are now well dressed and run out to meet them. These, I assure you, are not isolated cases—I could put my finger upon dozens of instances.

"We have had a good deal of distress amongst the labouring classes of our city this winter, and a charitable fund has been raised, by means of which we have aided about 500 families. Since the commencement of the fund about 2,500 persons have been aided; not more than one or two applicants have had the least appearance of liquor about them —many of these individuals were, a year ago, constantly under the influence of liquor.

"The causes that have operated to require this aid, are—1st. The direct result of a past intemperate life, especially among the foreigners, which with us are chiefly Irish with a mixture of German. 2nd. From the pressure of the times, the manufacturing business has depressed very much. The consequence was, that persons who hitherto made a living for themselves are now getting assistance from this fund. One principal reason for the scarcity of work amongst that class was the stopping of the works at Coltville. Col. Colt is erecting new works in the neighbourhood, and since last spring has had more than a thousand labourers, Irish and German, constantly employed—his expenditure has been over $2,000 a day ; but since the 1st December, when the frost became severe, this outside work was stopped, and hundreds of these poor creatures had nothing else to depend upon.

"The fund originated in this way: a gentleman—whose name I give you in confidence, although you will not publish it—met with some of the wealthy citizens and said he would give $500 to alleviate the distress if they would subscribe liberally and get others to do so. The result was that $3,700 were raised, and from that fund we are supporting as many as are really destitute. I am satisfied that had liquor been as freely got this winter as it was last winter, the number of people applying for charity would have been four-fold. In my rounds I have fallen in with instances of families selling even their bed-clothes for liquor, but I have not seen a solitary case of that sort this winter. The quarrelling, and fighting, and drinking, and black eyes, and so forth, hitherto so common, are now unknown. No one can witness the happy effects of this law amongst these poor people without feelings of the intensest gratitude to God, that in His good providence, such a law has been enacted."

John W. Bull, Hartford, Con.—"I have been engaged for the last twenty-five years in the importation and sale of earthenware here. I was opposed to the Maine Law when it passed, and when the selectmen called a meeting for the purpose of appointing agents to sell liquors for the purposes mentioned in the law, I and my friends opposed the appointment of agents, thinking thereby to render the law obnoxious to the people so as to make them demand its repeal. The agents were however, appointed, and we determined to let the law get a trial,—and from that time to this it has been growing in public favour. The friends with whom I acted in endeavoring to resist the law, are now all decidedly in favour of its enforcement. From personal observation, I state unhesitatingly that much good has been done by the enforcement of the law. The city is much more quiet both by day and night: property is considered more

secure, and property holders take a deep interest in maintaining the law.

"There is some drinking in the city still, but nothing like what it was formerly. Every case of drunkenness is now noticed, whereas formerly a drunken man was not molested if he kept quiet. There is no danger of the law being repealed,—any change will be to make it more stringent. Public opinion demands that all defects be remedied, in order to secure its thorough enforcement. I know many persons now anxious for the triumph of the law, who were violently opposed to it when it was enacted."

A. Dunham, of Dunham & Co., Commission Merchants, Hartford —"I have listened to the statements which Mr. Bull has just made, and am satisfied they are correct in every particular. The law is gradually making friends throughout the State. It is doing all its most sanguine friends expected; drunkenness and crime are decreasing rapidly; *peace* has visited many families where it has long been a stranger, and *plenty*, notwithstanding the "hard times," has in many cases, driven want from the poor man's door. No sane community would think of repealing such a law, and when the political demagogues who are now clamouring against it, fail—as fail they must—there will be no trouble in confining alcohol to its legitimate place on the shelf of the apothecary."

W. D. Minor, Stamford, Judge of County Court, Fairfield County —"Drunkenness was rife in the village of Stamford previous to the passing of the law,—since then very few cases have come under my notice. The law is decidedly beneficial, and property-holders everywhere are becoming more and more in favour of its strict enforcement. So strong is its hold upon the community already, that no political or other combination, in my opinion, could be entered into to repeal the law. Any change will be to make it more stringent in order to its more thorough enforcement. The opposition to it is chiefly based on the assumption that it interferes with the natural rights of the citizens, and the danger of the poor man's castle being invaded. But not a single case of hardship, from the right of search has ever been heard of: in fact search cannot be made in a private dwelling unless there are very good grounds for the authorities to entertain the belief that the owner has invaded the *sacredness* of his own house with the rum bottle, and turned it into a dram shop. Public opinion is bearing in strongly in favour of the law, and I have no doubt that in a few years it will be as easily and as thoroughly enforced as the laws against theft, licentiousness and gambling.

## THE *TIMES'* STATISTICS.

As the statistics of the Hartford *Morning Times* had caused some little stir amongst temperance people in that city during the day, we deemed it advisable to consult the jail records for ourselves, and having done so we were convinced of the correctness of Mr. Phelps' remark, that the jail statistics of the *Times* were got up to suit a purpose. Without an explanation, the figures taken by themselves represented a state of things entirely different from what existed, and the absence of this explanation when the nature of the statistics demanded it, showed very conclusively, and must have done so, to every honest-minded man, that they were printed to create a false impression, and were as essentially false in fact, as if the figures themselves had been forged for the occasion. The statistics were to the following effect:

*Commitments to the Hartford County Jail for Drunkenness.*

| Month of January, | 1850, | 1851, | 1852, | 1853, | 1854, | 1855. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 15 |

So the tide of drunkenness rolls on. The Maine law does not check it. We believe its tendency is to increase drunkenness.—*Daily Times.*

These statistics, taken by themselves, only prove that there were more commitments to the jail in 1855 for drunkenness than there were in 1850,—but the inference drawn by the *Times* would fain prove something more. Under the old law the commitments were nearly all to the Work-house, and not to the Jail, while the new law requires the commitments to be to the Jail. Under the old law there were few or no commitments for drunkenness, simply, as the fine when a prosecution for that offence was made, was only two dollars, and unless there was some breach of the peace growing out of the drunkenness, the sot was allowed to lie down or go on unpunished. Now, however, every man found drunk in the streets, no matter how quiet and harmless he may be, is taken up and punished for this as a criminal offence. In the subjoined list of commitments from 1850 to 1854 inclusive, it will be seen that as the commitments for drunkenness increase, the commitments for assault decrease. The parties are either picked up before they have time to give vent to their evil passions inflamed by drink, or else the law pounces upon a different class of persons from the mere drunken loafer or street fighter:

| | ASSAULTS. | | | | | DRUNKENNESS. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1850, | '51, | '52, | '53, | '54. | 1850, | '51, | '52, | '53, | 54. |
| August.. | 5 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Sept..... | 5 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 15 |
| Oct..... | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 16 |
| Nov..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 |
| Dec..... | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| | 19 | 18 | 8 | 18 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 61 |

We have been thus specific in regard to these statistics,—although in themselves of little moment,—because other statistics from other quarters have been cooked in the same way, with a view to deceive the public. Such short-sighted policy does not wear well—it will not stand the test.

The following extract from the Hartford *Courant* of the 21st December, 1854, gives a more correct idea of the workings of the Maine Law, than do the jail statistics of the *Times*. We had a very pleasant interview with Mr. Day, the Editor of the *Courant*, and therefore give the paragraph as coming from his own lips. "In the month of July there were twenty commitments to the Work house; in the month of August only eight. In the month of August 1853, sixteen. There have been twenty-three persons discharged from the Work-house since the 1st of August, 1854; and on Saturday, September 9th, there was not a single male person in the Work-house, which, except for two females, would have been tenantless. There has not been a parallel to this state of things, at any season of the year, for eight years at least, for how much longer we do not know, but we presume there never was. Is there a sane person who doubts for an instant what has caused this result?"

## NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT.

Having satisfied ourselves that the law was making itself felt in Hartford, we proceeded to New Haven, the alternating capital of Connecticut. Our first interview here was with the Rev.'d Leonard Bacon, D.D. The Dr. said: "It may be a question with some whether the Law is really executed in New Haven,—a city of not far from 30,000 inhabitants, among whom are fully 5,000 Irish Roman Catholics. There is no connivance at any violation of the Law, and there is no slackness, so far as I know, on the part of any officer entrusted with its administration. I believe the same thing may be said of the State generally. Even in towns where the municipal power is wielded by the adverse party, offenders are prosecuted, convicted, and punished. The complaint against the Law, by those who are opposed to it, is not that it is impracticable, but that it is vigorously and unsparingly executed.

"As to the effect of the execution of the law, certain it is that there is not an open dram shop in the city of New Haven. Wholesale and retail traders made arrangement beforehand to relinquish entirely that branch of their business on the appointed day—1st August—in deference to the Law. The only place known to the public, or the police, at which anybody can purchase any intoxicating beverage, or even pure alcohol, is the town agency, where it is sold only for

legitimate purposes, manufacturing, medicinal, and religious. No doubt there are persons who sell in violation of the law, just as there are thieves; but we do not, therefore, say that the law which punishes petty larceny is ineffectual.

"As to the ulterior purpose of the law,—the preventing intemperance; of course it does not entirely suppress intemperance. No man in his senses ever thought it would, in the present state of things. Liquor can be purchased in New York, only three hours distant from us, and all who are desirous can supply themselves in that way. But whoever is found drunk is arrested,—*without respect of persons*,—and if the liquor which made him drunk was purchased here, the vender is very sure to be convicted as soon as the purchaser is sober enough to testify.

"My belief is, that the Law has many more friends now than it had when it became operative. I did not take an active part in promoting the Law, for I did believe that our people in Connecticut would not agree to such a law; which proposed to set aside some of the old English safeguards, as to a man's house being his castle, and so forth. I said I did not believe our people would submit to it; but the result has proved that I was wrong, and the fears I entertained have not been realized in any one instance. So far as I know, the general feeling is one of increased satisfaction with the law. It is recognized by all respectable people: I mean by respectable people, those who make it a point to belong to religious congregations. Our Sundays are much more quiet than they were; although for many years past our authorities have been very rigid in enforcing an external respect for the Sabbath.

"For two months after the law passed, there was no town agent appointed, and then it was impossible to get any wine or liquor at all, without a violation of law. But this matter was speedily remedied.

The Dr. related to us an instance of arrest for intoxication, shortly after the law went into operation, which caused some stir in the city. The master of a coal vessel,—who had been in the habit of taking a little drop when he got ashore,—discharged a cargo of coals at the wharf; and having transacted his business on shore, started to go down to his vessel. He dropped into one of his old places, they told him the danger of acceding to his request, but gave him a little grog. He stepped into another, and after the same remonstrance, received an additional supply. In this way he made some half dozen calls, thinking that things were taking a strange turn when a sailor was not allowed to take a little grog openly, when he wished to pay for it. Unfortunately, however, the last drop was too many for him; and moving along towards the wharf rather top-heavy, he was picked up

by a policeman, for being more than half-seas over. He felt, when sobered a little, the awkward predicament into which he had got, and when taken before the Police Justice, frankly told the names of all the parties who had given him drink; and some half dozen arrests and convictions were forthwith made.

One other point stated by the Dr. was,—"Parties who stood aloof from the Temperance Reformation, now give in their adhesion, to the Maine Law. They consider that the question has assumed a new form. It is now no longer simply a question of Temperance, but a Governmental question, one of Legislative foresight and morality and, therefore, they wish to abide by the Law. According to the testimony of our city missionary,—who has the best opportunity of knowing,—families that were suffering last winter from destitution, are this winter provided with necessaries, notwithstanding the "hard times," because the dram shops are no longer open.

Rev'd. S. W. S. Dutton, New Haven; a gentleman who aided us very much in our mission, related a very pleasing instance of reformation in his own congregation, as the result of the law:—

"A young man of a respectable family, kind, pleasant and agreeable, who earned good wages as a mechanic,—the only support of a widowed mother and an only sister,—had got into dissipated habits; and for four or five years past would have gone on a drunken spree for weeks together; and was, consequently, a great source of affliction to his friends. Reasoning and remonstrance were in vain. But the Law came to his aid. The temptation was removed, and he has since done well. He has recently purchased a small house for his mother and sister, and furnished it comfortably. He is a regular attender at church; and expresses very feelingly his gratification at the enforcement of the law."

"There is much more hope of such a person standing, because no one could sell him liquor without very great danger. The penalty of a violation of our law is such, that it comes to be a question with sellers,—those who do so in secret,—whether the person is likely to get drunk or not. Mr. Smith, our City missionary, has told me that in his visits among the poor this winter he finds a great difference indeed. Men who, last year, left their families in want by their intemperance, who were accustomed to spend all their earnings upon drink, have, since the operation of the Law, spent their earnings upon their families; and those families who, last winter, were badly off, are this winter, even with the depression of business, comfortably supported. Our cases of destitution this winter are almost all of that class who were reduced to the lowest verge, by intemperance, before the passing of the Law. The officers of our benevolent associations

say that they have a different class of persons to support this winter. And our grocers tell us that many of those families who bought little else but rum at their stores, are now supplied with healthful and comfortable food. If they do get drink, they get it at other places.

"There is no kind of question as to the very beneficial workings of the Law in this city. The statement that it has produced more drunkenness, is most entirely untrue. No man would say so, but one who intentionally meant to deceive. Such is not the case in any of our cities where the Law is enforced. Unfortunately, in some of our cities, certain political parties have taken ground against the law. In this city, generally, the Democratic party have set themselves against the Law, and they are apt to make reckless assertions sometimes to serve a political purpose. Their great theory is that you will not, by legislation, make men moral or virtuous. They seem to forget that the first end of government is the protection of the citizens.

E. M. Gorham, Esq., editor of the Maine Law *Advocate*, New Haven, expressed himself very warmly in favour of the Law, and shewed very conclusively that in the mere matter of criminal punishment, the City of New Haven would be a gainer of upwards of $8000 annually by the enforcement of the law. These arguments we need not here repeat.

"The arrests, by the night watchmen of New Haven, for assaults and breaches of the peace have fallen off more than two-thirds; although you will find that here, as in Hartford, the arrests for drunkenness have greatly increased. But this is easily explained. All parties are now arrested, who are in any way intoxicated; whereas before they were only taken up when they had committed some offence against the peace of the community. Intemperance has greatly diminished in this city, and that, too, amongst our Irish or foreign population; and family comforts have, amongst them, greatly increased. Many of those who were supported with coal last winter by the town, have not applied for such aid this winter. Their answer invariably is, now that rum is gone, everything is pleasant and comfortable at home. Many such instances have come to my own knowledge.

J. J. Waite, Esq., of Norwich, whom we met in New Haven, said: "The Law is working admirably in Norwich. Its effects upon the community are very good. The village was formerly noted for drunkenness, but now an intoxicated man is seldom met with. The Law has gained the good will of the better classes of the community. I know many persons there who went against the Law, because they were told it would infringe their rights as citizens, who, now that they have seen it enforced, are decidedly in favour of it. Many

of the working people of Norwich were against it; but now that they are deprived of an opportunity of getting liquor, their money is expended in providing necessaries and comforts for their families, and they now find the great advantage it has conferred upon them. The general effect of the Law has been to give a higher tone to morality, and a keener sense of religious feeling than was manifested in Norwich previous to its passing. Liquor is no where sold openly in the village. If it is got, it must be secretly.

Rev'd. Mr. Sill, Episcopal Church City Missionary, New Haven. "I was called here especially to look after that class of persons who do not go any where to church. Amongst that class the Maine Law has produced a very comfortable state of things. Heads of families who formerly spent all their wages in intemperance, have begun to provide comfortably for their families. That class of persons who this winter,—had the old state of things continued,—would have come upon us for support,—have some little to give themselves to our mission funds. The Law has diminished drinking amongst that class. Its good effects are decisive:—It works to admiration. Many poor families who, for want of clothing, were prevented from attending church, now look forward with delight to the prospect of attending some place of worship."

Professor Silliman.—"My impression is, that the Law has worked very favourably. I am not now in the college, and cannot say so much from actual experience there, but I have heard several of the students speak of the Law as having produced a very decidedly good effect upon the students generally. Not a quart of wine or liquor is drunk now, where before gallons were used. I am decidedly of opinion that it has produced a very marked change in the college. There are at present about 400 students. It has also produced a great change in the general customs of Society. My wife has been in the habit of visiting amongst the poor, and in houses where before she used to find misery and vice, she now finds happiness and comfort."

Mr. Mathieson Freshman, Yale College.—"All our classes are free from the use of liquors. I think if they were inclined to intemperance I should have heard of it. There are no places about college that I know of where liquor of any sort can be got."

Professor Thacher, Yale College.—"I am convinced that the Law has made a very great difference amongst our students. Formerly some of them used to drink so as to be affected by it. They got the liquors at the Medical Halls, nicely labelled as cordials, and kept it in their own rooms. Such a thing is now entirely unknown. We have had no case of intemperance in the college since the Law passed, that I know of. It was whispered about that the Chief of Police had escorted

two young gentlemen to their lodgings recently, who, but for his kindness, might have been arrested. It is believed that he has frequently made himself serviceable in this way. But we have no outward indications now amongst the students, that drink is used. There is none of that noise and uproar amongst them that used to be. The only objection we can have to the Law is that it does not stretch far enough. Persons can send to New York for a basket of champagne, and get it delivered at their houses without any difficulty. It has been reported that some of the students have done this, but I have seen no instance of it myself."

Mr. Dwight, resident Tutor, Yale College.—"The results of the Law have been much more favorable on the Institution than I had any idea they possibly could be. The Law has made a very decided difference in the College. I have no doubt there is some drinking still, but it must be greatly diminished, for its outside developements are entirely done away. I live in the College, and have an opportunity of seeing what goes on; and I am satisfied that College Government is now much more easy than it was before the operations of the Maine Law.

Rev. Dr. Kennaday, New Haven.—"I can only say that at a very early period I engaged in the temperance reformation. I formed the first temperance society in the State of Maryland, and have been in the field a good deal. I find now, however, that since this law went into operation I have hardly anything to do. The work seems to be pretty well all done up. As far as I am acquainted with the State—and I hate visited many parts of it, and have met with men from all parts of it—the law has produced the happiest results. I know personally, several gentlemen who have a large number of men in their employ, and their united testimony is decidedly in favour of the law. I think there is a great improvement in the sabbath school attendance since the law went into operation. I think that in this city and in the city of Philadelphia, (where I resided seven years,) we have reached the greater part of our own congregations by moral suasion. I think you will find that it is the people generally who belong to the Catholic Church who are in the traffiic, and who do all the drinking. I find that these people, wherever you may go, are a constant barrier in the way of progress. I am sufficiently acquainted with all the Methodist churches in the State to say that the opinion I have given would be universally endorsed by them."

His Excellency the Hon. Governor Dutton.—"I believe you already know my sentiments pretty well, in regard to the operations of the law. I am exceedingly gratified to find the friends of temperance in Canada so deeply interested in our movements. Were I to say that

the law was not even exceeding the most sanguine anticipations of its friends, I would state what is contrary to my firmest convictions. I have recently returned from Boston, where I had the pleasure of addressing the State Temperance Convention. I there gave my opinion of the working of the law. So much of that speech as you require to convey to your friends in Canada, my decided conviction of the beneficial results, of the law, you may use, as if you had it from my own lips. In a letter to Mr. Delavan, of Albany, I said:—

"I hazard nothing by asserting that no candid enemy of the law will deny, that it has proved more efficient than its most sanguine friends anticipated. It has completely swept the pernicious traffic, as a business, from the State. An open groggery cannot be found. I have not seen a person here in a state of intoxication since the first of August. In our cities and manufacturing villages, streets that were formerly constantly disturbed by drunken brawls, are now as quiet as any other.

"The change is so palpable, that many who have been strongly opposed to such a law have been forced to acknowledge the efficacy of this. At the late State Agricultural Fair it was estimated that on one day from 20,000 to 30,000 persons of every condition in life were assembled, and not a solitary drunkard was seen, and not the slightest disturbance was made—the effect was so manifest, that the law has been regarded with more favor since than it was before. The statistics of our courts and prisons prove that criminal prosecutions are rapidly diminishing in number. Some Jails are almost tenantless.

"The law has been thoroughly executed with much less difficulty and opposition than was anticipated. In no instance has a seizure produced any general excitement. Resistance to the law would be unpopular; and it has been found in vain to set it at defiance. The longer the beneficial results of the law are seen and felt, the more firmly it becomes established. The ridiculous idea, so industriously circulated, that the sanctity of domestic life would be invaded, has been shown to be a mere bugbear. *The home of the peaceful citizen was never before so secure.* The officers of the law have no occasion to break into his dwelling, and he is now free from the intrusion of the lawless victims of intemperance."

## GOVERNOR DUTTON'S SPEECH.

Gov. Dutton, on being presented, was received with hearty applause. He said he had come hither without the license of *all* his constituents. There were some of them who would object to his going abroad to enlighten the citizens of other States, but many of them preferred he should do it abroad,—if on this subject,—rather than at

home. (Applause.) Some had even said that for this, his time was short; if this were so, he thought he must work while the day lasts. (Renewed applause.) He might possibly be regarded as a fugitive; if so he knew they would take good care of him. (Laughter.) He knew the assembly did not expect a temperance address from him, but simply to learn how the prohibitory law operated in Connecticut. (Applause.) He therefore proposed to make some statements merely in this regard for the benefit of this State.

And, first, he would say, that, in his judgment, that law been fully operative and beneficial. The absence of crime, the order which everywhere prevailed, the diminution of rowdyism, the quietude which generally obtained, all proved that the law worked its mission, and was a blessing to the community. In New Haven, where he had his walks, and knew its people, he did not hesitate to say, that you might search as with a candle, and it would be almost impossible to find even the amount of a gallon of intoxicating liquor except at the town agency. He would not say that it might not be found in some out-of-the-way, obscure and hidden hole. Where is the place where laws, even the best and most popular, are not violated—the law against burglary, against theft, and other crimes. It was expected here in Boston; and what was true in regard to violations of law here, was doubtless also true in regard to the prohibitory law in his city. But, generally speaking, the law was most successfully and triumphantly sustained in New Haven. And what was true of New Haven, was also true of other towns in Connecticut. He had the means, from his official position, as well as from other sources, of learning the operation of that law, and he was prepared to say that it had been most complete. Gentlemen engaged in shipping, in mechanical pursuits, in trade, in all the parts of the State, bore the same testimony —that the law was being carried into effect and had a most beneficial result upon their respective communities.

The correspondence which he had, as well with the newspaper press, as in letters from prominent individuals, all tended to the same indisputable conclusion. Now, he was a lawyer, accustomnd to look at evidence, and he knew not what interpretation to put on all this mass of evidence, save this, that it was conclusive that the law was most successful in removing intemperance, crime and immorality. Quoting the statements of the Hartford *Times*, that the law had not been successful, that crime had increased under it in Hartford, New Haven, and other places, and that the assertions of the Governor, at a meeting in New York, were not correct in relation to the operation of the law, &c., he showed their utter fallacy, and the impotency of the so called facts which that paper adduced in support of its statements. He ex-

amined "the statistics," also, put forth by the *Times*, and showed them to be totally unreliable and even fictitious. It really seemed strange that the editor of that sheet did not see that he was risking his well earned reputation for mendacity, in putting forth such bald statements, which carried no probability whatever, in them. (Great laughter.)

Gov. Dutton passed to say that before the law went into operation, it was customary to see things in New Haven as they were in the city of New York. There was rowdyism, intoxication, riding out on Sunday, &c. Since then nothing of the kind was noticed. The last time he was in New York, he was nearly jostled off the side-walk by a drunken man; but he *had not seen a drunken man in Connecticut since the passage of the law.* (Applause.) What caused this great difference? What made New Haven different from New York? It was solely and only because Connecticut had a prohibitory liquor law. (Renewed applause.) Quoting further some remarks of the *Times*, that he was "a greedy office seeker," the Governor said that formerly an office seeker had to stand upon a rum barrel; but now if he wished office he must promote virtue rather than vice; he must stand up firm for all that promotes benevolence and humanity. He should now let it pass that the audience took it for granted that the prohibitory liquor law *was* successful, and had accomplished its mission.

That law in Connecticut was drawn up with a great deal of care by those who had had experience in such matters. The laws of Massachusetts, and Maine, and other States, were examined; and keen men, who knew the shifts and subterfuges to which men under conviction of rumselling would resort to, to escape, passed upon its everyprovision. Their law had many good features. It was a *simple* law, in all its parts. When it took hold of a man for drunkenness, it dealt with him for that offence. The complaint for that was coupled with no other misdemeanor. So in regard to other particulars. It did one thing at a time. The accused had a distinct trial on the charge; and he was fully tried, having every opportunity to be heard, while the case was patiently considered. He did not hesitate to say that at the time the law was passed *it was the most effective and perfect law for the subject then in existence.* (Applause.) Another great and effective feature of the law was its seizure clause—which struck at the root of the matter, and did much to render the enactment popular with the masses, who saw the source of the trouble, and who like to see a thing done up "brown," or not at all. (Laughter and applause.) Another feature of the law, which gave it popularity and efficiency, was the provision that if a man was found publicly, drunk, he should

be detained till he told where he got drunk, or was punished for being drunk. (Applause.) It cools off a man's appetite wonderfully if he has the prospect of a prison ahead; and, on the other hand, it serves to make the dealer consider how many doses he can administer to a man before *he* is compromised—he learns just how long it is before a toper will reveal a secret; for it did not take a great while for the cold walls of a prison to loosen the tongue of a drinker, and make him tell where he got his potion. (Laughter and applause.)

"The result of these two principles had given the law of Connecticut a great amount of its efficiency. Without them, nothing would make the law popular with the people. Yet it would be very strange if their law was without its defects. There was one clause that towns *might* appoint agents; and it was found that some places all of a sudden became wonderfully teetotal; every voter would march up to the polls and vote against any agent at all, the enemies of the law supposing that if no agency was established, a great inconvenience would be experienced by temperance men. But they found that temperance men could do without liquor as long as any body else, and longer too; and those who were not friends of the law were soon glad to go in for the agencies, and they now existed, suitably regulated, in nearly all the towns. The law wanted a provision that would break up the practice of buying liquors by the quantity and their conveyance to club rooms, where they were dealt out to young men. It also wanted a provision preventing the transportation of liquors over the State by common carriers. He was glad to learn that it was probable these important features would be incorporated into the law soon to be submitted to the Massachusetts Legislature. They were essential to a perfect and efficient statute.

"Gov. Dutton passed some congratulatory remarks on the position of Massachusetts, and what the rest of the Union hoped and expected from her example. He trusted she would be true to her ancient fame. He alluded to the interest felt by other States in the Connecticut law, and the numerous applications he received for copies of that law, some of the States receiving them, following out its provisions in their prohibitory laws. He cited Michigan as an instance, whose new Governor was as strong a Maine Law man as himself. He ventured the prediction that not many years would pass before every State north of the Potomac would have a stringent liquor law. (Applause.) He concluded with some peculiarly happy and felicitous remarks appropriate to the State and the occasion, which were warmly applauded."

In our transit from New Haven to Hartford, we had a very interesting discussion with Judge Huntingdon of Hartford, and several other gentlemen of the democratic faith who had been attending a democratic

Convention at New Haven. The Judge expressed himself warmly against the law, as interfering with the right which every citizen of the United States had, to seek his own comfort in the way that seemed to him best. Some of his remarks were taken down, but as he expressed a wish to write out his opinions carefully when he got home, and promised faithfully to transmit them to our address at Boston, we fully expected to have had the pleasure of incorporating his opposition in our Report. But the document never reached us, and although we were assured by friends that the Judge would not write, we will not violate our pledge by giving any of his statements, for they might place him in a less favourable light than that in which a gentleman holding so high a position in society would wish to be placed.

## PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.

From New Haven we proceeded to Providence, Rhode Island, returning by Hartford. Here we met the Hon. A. C. Barstow, Mayor of Providence, and promoter of the Maine Law in Rhode Island. Mr. Barstow said, "In my inaugural address as Mayor of Providence, shortly after the passing of the law, I thus indicated to the Council my feelings in regard to it. At the last session of our Legislature, a law was passed for the suppression of drinking houses and tippling shops, which is to go into operation on the third Monday of July next (1852.) Our present laws prohibit the sale of spirituous liquors as a beverage, except when the freemen of the towns, by vote, allow their town council to license the traffic; but the penalty for their violation is so light as to render them entirely worthless in this city or in the densely populated towns. The law which is soon to go into operation, contains a variety of features more stringent than were ever embodied in any former legislation upon this subject. Heretofore we have sought to regulate this traffic by law—now we seek to suppress it. It is believed that a wise and firm enforcement of this law will soon suppress the traffic in these liquors to a great extent, and thus rid our city of much of the alarming amount of evil resulting therefrom. As it is better, and in the experience of a sister State (where a similar law is in operation) cheaper, to prevent the evils resulting from this traffic, than to punish the crimes, and alleviate the poverty and distress occasioned by it, I shall deem it my duty to see that this, as well as every other law, is justly and impartially enforced. I trust that those who have been engaged in this traffic, will deem it a matter of policy and duty to yield a quiet submission to the law, and thus save the magistrate the necessity of performing a disagreeable duty. The law must be honoured, either in its observance, or in the infliction of its penal sanctions. Every interest of society demands it—every senti-

ment of my heart approves it. I deem it my duty, thus early to make the announcement, that all may have timely warning. The execution of this law may seem hard and oppressive to a few who are engaged in this traffic, but they must bear in mind that the want of such a law has been esteemed a greater hardship by a multitude who either directly or indirectly have suffered by it. Under our happy government, Law, is the will of the people, constitutionally expressed. All government necessarily abridges individual liberty. Living in a state of nature, a man's rights may be measured by his might; but, in voluntarily entering a state of society, he agrees to unite with others in fixing rules for the government of the whole. If any of these rules in their operation bear with undue severity upon himself, he has a legal remedy, or if in their just execution, they limit or restrain his liberty too far, to suit his taste, or supposed interests, he may choose another society more congenial to his feelings. If, however, he continues in the society, he is bound, as a good citizen, to respect its rules, and bow with proper submission to its decrees. Private interest must yield when the public good requires it; and the individual who resists the law in any other than a constitutional way, on the ground of private right, commits treason against the State, shows himself unworthy of the society which has hitherto sheltered and protected him, and as a transgressor of one law, cuts himself off from all claim for protection under any other."

"These were my opinions prior to the enforcement of the law. After it had been in operation three months, I published the following statistics, showing that the law in that short time had made a reduction of nearly 60 per cent. in our monthly committals, while the number of insane paupers in Butler Hospital was reduced about one-fifth:—

Committals to the watch-house for drunkenness, and small assaults growing out of drunkenness, from July 19, to October 19, 1852, (the first three months under the new liquor law).....177

Committals to the watch-house for corresponding months of last year .....282

Committals to the watch house for one month immediately preceding the operation of the new law .....153

Committals to the county jail from July 19 to October 19, 1852, (the first three months under the new liquor law), for State offences.....77

For city offences .....22—99

Do do for the corresponding months of last year, for State offences .....110

For city offences .....51—161

For city offences for one month preceding the operation of the new liquor law, for State offences .....40
For city offences .....32— 72

"Our law is well sustained by the people. The leading men in the State have sustained it, some from policy, but I have no doubt the great majority from principle. We feel that the law is so thoroughly established on our Statute Book that no party or combination dare attempt to repeal it. Our Legislature, which are now in session here, are strongly in favor of it, and I have no doubt its good results will be more felt when we have had a longer trial of it. I shall have much pleasure in introducing you to some of our representatives."

Hon. W. R. Watson, Secretary of State for Rhode Island. "I have just prepared a statement in reply to a circular from the State Office at Washington. In that I express as fully as possible my views of the beneficial results of the Maine Law in Rhode Island. I stated in effect—The Prohibitory Liquor Law, generally known as the Maine Law, has been in operation in this State about two years and a-half. Its effects I cannot doubt have been greatly to diminish crime, pauperism, misery, and that long and dark catalogue of moral, social and physical evils which result from intemperance. The statistics of State prisons, Poor-houses and Lunatic Asylums, here as well as everywhere else, conclusively show that a very large proportion of the inmates of those abodes of misery, are the sad victims of this, the greatest of the evils that afflict our country. Whatever, therefore, operates to diminish intemperance must necessarily largely and efficiently contribute to relieve society from its terrible consequences. As intemperance diminishes, the number of State offences decreases, and the money worse than wasted by individuals in intoxicating drinks, goes to purchase the necessaries of life. The cases of abject poverty, broken constitutions, ruined reputations and blasted hopes, in many instances the immediate exciting causes of insanity and raving madness, are proportionally lessened. The moral and social condition of the community is thus improved and elevated. The Sabbath is better observed, the attendance upon public worship is increased, and individual comfort and public prosperity promoted. Such have been the salutary effects of the enforcement of the Maine Liquor Law in this State. Its FRUITS HAVE BEEN GOOD, and the blessings of health, happiness and peace; of drunkards redeemed and restored to their friends; of scattered families re-united and made happy; of neighborhoods riotous and disorderly made quiet,—which flow from it, would seem to attest the sanction of a higher power, and demonstrate its accordance with natural and Divine Laws. It is true that this law has had to contend

against severe and various opposition in this State, as it has done and must do everywhere else. It has had to combat long and inveterate individual habits and old time-honored customs. It has had to encounter the heartless avarice of those who are engaged in the liquor traffic. It has had to work its way through all the formulas and technicalities of the old imported English Common Law, and all the delays, quibbles and subtleties of those whose business it is to interpose between violated laws and merited punishment. But it has generally triumphed, and its course is now, as it has been from the first—*onward*, CONQUERING and to conquer. There is one remarkable fact which stands out prominently in the history of this Law, wherever it has been tried, and that is,—it never recedes. Its onward course has ever been steady and sure. It holds every inch of ground it gains in public opinion, and in the face of the strongest opposition, works its way quietly but certainly to general adoption and final acquiescence. This fact clearly proves that its appeal to the moral sense of men and communities is irresistible.

"The general feeling of respectable citizens in this State is decidedly favorable to the Law. It has been repeatedly subjected to all kinds of popular tests, and has always commanded large majorities in its favor. It was enacted by our Legislature in January, 1852, by a decided majority. The question has been since submitted to a direct vote of the qualified electors of the State, whether this law should be continued or not? which resulted in an overwhelming majority in favor of its continuance, and in the two Legislatures which have been elected since its passage, there has been such large majorities favorable to it, that no attempt even has been made to effect its repeal. I have always been in favor of this law. I advocated it when it was first enacted by our General Assembly; I voted to continue it in operation when that question was submitted to the popular vote; I am still decidedly in favor of it, and of its firm, faithful and efficient enforcement. I believe this law is destined to achieve very great and beneficial results, moral, social and political to this State, and to every State which shall be wise enough to adopt it. When it has been adopted by, and done its good work in, a large majority of the States of the Union, as I believe it ultimately will, its friends will then be prepared to march upon the Capital and demand of Congress that the importation of all wines and other liquors, whether in large or small packages, shall be wholly and for ever prohibited. When this shall have been accomplished, as accomplished I trust it shall be, the last fortress of the greatest foe to individual happiness and the public peace in our country, will have fallen."

## BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

From Providence we proceeded to Boston, where we met with Rev.'d Dr. Beecher, Deacon Grant, Dr. Stone, Mr. Slack, Mr. Morse, and several other devoted friends of the cause.

Dr. James Stone, one of the representatives for the City of Boston, whom, along with Mr. Slack, we met in the House of Assembly, said, "I have recently given my opinion in regard to the operations of the Law, at some length, to a gentleman resident in Birmingham, lately a member of the British Parliament. I do not know that I could at present add much to these statements, further than this, that longer experience only confirms me in the beneficial results of the Law wherever it is enforced. Use, therefore, as much of that document as you require to convey to your friends my candid testimony in favor of the Law. Our amended Law has passed this House by a large majority, and we have very little fears for it in the Senate."

The previous part of the Dr.'s communication, which refers chiefly to the passage of the Law in the various states, and the arguments in regard to its constitutionality, we need not here repeat. We commence then at Ans. No. 6:—

6. There is a difference of opinion concerning the working of the Law, but its friends generally control the Temperance organizations of this State and throughout the country. Clergymen, anti-slavery, and total abstinence men, are almost unanimously friendly to the Law. Hotel keepers, liquor sellers, grocers, apothecaries, and regular drinkers are about as unanimously opposed to it. Moderate drinkers are divided in sentiment. My own opinion can be very briefly expressed. Naturally shrinking with aversion from some of the more stringent portions of the Law, in consequence of an early and unrepressed feeling in favor of the largest phase of personal liberty, which includes an opposition to general sumptuary Legislation, I looked upon the Law, when first enacted in our sister State, with some suspicion. But the statistics exhibiting its remarkable effects in securing the diminution of crime, of intemperance and of pauperism, early compelled me to waive all my scruples. I therefore believe it to be, in the main, widely beneficent in its operation, at the same time that I regard it to be subject, as is all other human legislation, to such amendment and improvement, as the course of time and the wisdom of experience shall best evince their necessity, in order the better to accomplish its important objects. The statistics concerning the diminution of pauperism and crime are in the accompanying papers. I know no reason why such diminution should not continue permanent.

From time immemorial, persons charged with crime, and whose principles are not firmly fixed, have endeavored to avoid the conse-

quences thereof, by evasions and subterfuges. As in the past, so it will be in the future, until human nature undergoes transformation. The Law in question was early subject to this criticism. Yet I know not why it should be more properly amenable to it than any other law has been or would be, which has exerted, or which can exert over the passions and follies of men, an equal control.

It is one of the peculiarities of this Law, whatever theories drawing a different conclusion, we might in advance apply to it, that where it has been most efficiently executed, there the greatest results in the suppression of crime and pauperism have been most satisfactorily achieved, and it has seized with such strong hold on the hearts of the people, that its popularity has in those places become invincible.

7. From the best evidence that I can gather concerning the influence of unaided moral measures, the average effect of pledges to total abstinence, is that fifty per cent. adhere for a single year, thirty-three per cent for five years, and twenty-five per cent permanently. In procuring the most decisive results from moral suasion, organization into permanent associations has undoubtedly been productive of much good. And the Temperance Societies of the country have generally long since given up as a failure the early efforts of organization for the sake of partial abstinence, and now strenuously advocate total abstinence only.

8. There can be little doubt that the moral means resorted to for the purpose of repressing intemperance have at once produced good results, and at the same time prepared the public mind for compulsory measures.

9. The opposition of those previously engaged in the traffic, where the Law has been thoroughly executed, has been sometimes removed by a very simple process. Many, acting as law-abiding citizens among a law-loving people in a law-maintaining State, have at once relinquished their sales, and commenced other occupations. Others have been indicted and the liquors destroyed. They have resumed business and the enactment has been again enforced. Then, deterred either by the prospect of the loss of means or the nearer vision of the State Prison, they have transferred their capital into other branches of industry, and thereupon a two-fold object induces them to maintain the Law; first, their interests are no longer absorbed in its infraction; and second, being themselves prevented from violating the Law, they are naturally desirous of prohibiting others from exercising privileges which they do not themselves possess.

So far as the first two questions in your letter of the twentieth are concerned, there is a uniformity of opinion. No considerable class of our citizens maintain that *beneficial* results accrue from the constant

use of alcoholic drinks as a beverage. The radical difference between the Temperance men and their opponents, is rather upon the question, "Do *injurious* results follow such use?" one class of the community contending for the affirmative, and another class for the negative of the proposition; while the latter class do not generally go so far as to maintain the absolute improvement of the health and strength from such use.

The answer to the third question deserves more consideration. Having relation to the habitual use of alcohol, medicinally, it demands a professional and scientific investigation and decision.

Within the last few years, a careful scrutiny into autoptical results has appeared to justify scientific medical gentlemen in the conclusion that there exist two natural antagonists to tubercular disease. The first of these antagonists is cancer; malignant disease seizing hold of some one of the tissues or vital organs, and continually increasing, accompanied with severe pain, until it results in death from *carcinoma*. The second of these antagonists is alcohol; that is, cases of death ensuing from drunkenness or *delirum tremens*. In both these classes of cases, scientific research has apparently shown that tubercular disease is not progressing actively in the lungs; and in accordance with the theory of Louis, which is deemed to be correct, that whenever tubercular disease exists in the brain, the liver, the mesenteric glands, the kidneys, or in any part of the system, it exists also in the lungs, so conversely, if it does not exist in the lungs, as in the instances adduced, it does not exist in any part of the system. But in giving a response affirmatively in favor of a very small class of invalids using alcohol in some shape, strictly under medical prescriptions, it is only just to add that the attempt, even if successful, to avoid consumption by the unrestrained use of alcoholic stimulants, substitutes, equally with the avoidance of the same disease by means of cancer, a far more horrible and painful death, and thereby becomes manifold worse than a desertion of Scylla to perish by Charybdis. The Maine Law, however, provides for the legitimate use of alcohol for chemical, mechanical, sacramental, and medicinal purposes.

The fourth question of this date refers to the climate and its necessary influence over our habits in the use of wines, &c. As a general rule, in different parts of the country, the character of the water exercises a greater ostensible control than the climate. West of the principal Atlantic cities, the water is, in many places, either impregnated with lime, discolored by the soil, or offensive to the taste, and it is the custom of many, seeking an excuse for their luxurious habits, to attribute the cause to the water, rather than to their own perverted appetites.

To allude to my own experience, allow me to say that while travelling in different parts of the country many of my acquaintances, particularly in parts of New York State, South Carolina, Kentucky, Missouri, and Canada, have insisted that it was unhealthy to drink the water of the place, and have therefore strongly urged the use of wines and brandies; but it was observed that, while refusing myself to follow their kind advice, those of my travelling companions who were more fearless or less scrupulous, were also much more liable to temporary illness than myself. The fourth question is answered in the negative.

But why, after all the efforts that have been made, do drunkenness and the crime and pauperism consequent thereon, still continue? The answer is, The Law has not yet been carried into complete effect. The cases have not yet been adjudicated before our highest Courts. Obstructions have been constantly placed in the way. Great improvement of morals has, however, been made.

Not many years since, many artisans and employeés, such as shoemakers, stage-drivers, &c., were habitually accustomed to drink freely. *Now*, the practice has much abated, and we even hear of stage-drivers' Temperance Conventions; while the money formerly devoted to the purchase of liquor is now used to elevate them into a higher position in society, and to satisfy those wants which that higher position originates.

No branch of the Temperance Reform has more thoroughly succeeded than that which has had reference to public entertainments. It is only, I think, since the time of Mayor Quincy, jr., now about eight years, that the public dinners of this city have been prepared upon a temperance plan. And at this time, nearly all the great public festivals and entertainments in this vicinity, at which several hundred people are expected to be present, including the time-honored Commencement Dinner of Harvard University, are conducted upon temperance principles, no beverage being provided but lemonade, water, and coffee. The transformation of public opinion that would allow of this change has only been gradually achieved. But its accomplishment has been the result of the expenditure of much labor, time and money.

The questions that you have forwarded have been, in a measure, answered. I would greatly have preferred that they should have been presented to others far better able than myself, from their experience in such matters and from their knowledge of the subject, to communicate important facts, and deduce therefrom correct inferences. If, however, what has been written is of any value, it is at your service."

We attended a meeting of the State Temperance Committee, whose

Head-quarters is in Boston. After they had transacted some routine business, we expressed a desire to hear the opinions of Dr. Beecher on the Law, and its tendencies. The reverend and worthy old gentleman, —who has long since passed his three score years and ten, but still hale and fresh looking—threw aside his overcoat, and having given us a rapid and graphic outline of the temperance movement from its commencement in 1810 to the present time, he said: "This thing is of GOD. You may stave it off by law, until you have got a majority of the people to force it through; but carry it you must, and no man so foolish as not to see its success is greater than could have been conceived. It is GOD'S Work, every step of the way perfect as we go along. When at the early commencement we got advanced one stage, we came to a stand, and then we were inspired, in a certain sense, to see what to do next. But we never went back, although we slept on our arms sometimes. Public sentiment somehow got prepared for another step. I have the same confidence that GOD has done this, as I have that He planted the Gospel in the times of the Apostles, and carried it forward against fire and sword. With two or three exceptions, all the Clergymen in this city are with us in the movement; we are all as one in this great question. We are in the hardest place, perhaps, in this Continent, but we have done great things even here, and now we are about to reap the fruits of all our labours. Our great opposition has come from politicians, and from the rum-sellers themselves. We could have put the thing down in a fortnight, but for politicians; but public sentiment here, notwithstanding all our disadvantages, is decidedly in our favour. Nobody believes we are going back. Some people say there is more liquor drunk in Boston than there was before; few people believe it. The impulse in favor of prohibition is very strong, it is rapidly gaining ground, and will speedily prevail."

Mr. W. B. Spooner, one of the committee, said:—"The present state of public opinion is very strongly set in favour of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, and the Legislature is such at present that the temperance committee can get such a law as they please. It is rather difficult to restrain them from making it more stringent than we wish it to be. The principle of prohibition has gained ground very rapidly within these two years past. Last year in the house of representatives there was a majority of 40 in favour of the law. The Senate had a small majority. This year I believe that more than three fourths of both branches of the Legislature are in favour of it. Even the newspapers which have hitherto opposed the movement, say there is no doubt that you will get the Law, but you will never stop intemperance in that way. That remains to be seen; the mass of the people are in favour of it, and there is no doubt it will be carried out. The present law

eliminated of the right of seizure and the destruction of the liquor is already in operation in a large share of the country towns and has suppressed the open traffic in the majority of them.

"In Worcester, Cambridge, Roxbury and many other such places the law is very well carried out this year.

"In Lowell, a considerable difficulty arose, as to which court should have jurisdiction, and many of the cases that were prosecuted stood over for more than a twelvemonth. When the law went into force there, two years last July, Mr. Huntingdon was Mayor, and he went right about the law and put it in force, and shut up 275 public houses. During that year, pauperism and crime were reduced at least two-thirds. Next year Mayor Huntingdon was promoted to an office in the Government, and his successor lacked the energy necessary to carry through the law. Many of the cases that were carried through the courts, were quashed in consequence of some informality, and the people got somewhat discouraged, and are waiting on for the new law. It was a singular fact that Judge Merrick one of the Judges of the Superior Court gave as his decision that the police Justice of Lowell had no jurisdiction, and in consequence of this decision upwards of 100 cases were broken down. The Supreme Court afterwards decided that Judge Merrick's decision was unsound and this broke down some 100 more cases. But the operations of the law during Mayor Huntingdon's rule show the following satisfactory results:—'The effect of the law thus far has been to annihilate many hundreds of drinking shops; while thousands have been compelled to suspend or secrete their operations. More than two hundred have been suppressed in Lowell alone. In various parts of the State,—Newton, Taunton, Springfield, Pittsfield, there have been held musters, cattle-shows, public celebrations, at which the peace and order have surprised all spectators, and opened a new era in the history of such assemblages. During the first two months of the law's operation, the diminution of the arrests for drunkenness in Salem was seventy-seven per cent. If there has since been a relapse, it is from no defect in the law; it was enforced long enough to show its power.'

Charles W. Morse, Esq., proprietor of the *Boston Telegraph*:—"You will find this to be a fact in connexion with Boston at the present time, that there are double the number of liquor houses here that there was a year ago, for this reason: They have been driven from all the country places, from Cambridge, from Roxbury, from Charleston, and many other places, and they have found a resting place in Boston for a short time, because the law was not here enforced.

Mr. D. W. Alvord of Greenfield 108 miles from Boston said:—"About a year ago there were between 20 and 30 grog shops in Greenfield,

I don't think there is one now in the village. The enforcement of the law broke them up entirely. Within two years past there were open grog shops in very many of the towns in the county of Franklin; at this moment I do not think there are 10 in the whole county. The decrease is owing entirely to the enforcement of the Law. It has been a blessing beyond anything we ever have had, and I am satisfied that wherever it is enforced it will prove a blessing to the community. Its effects in lessening rowdyism are very marked. Before the law passed, our streets were noisy and riotous, and it was unsafe for any female to venture out in the evening unprotected. I was afraid to send my own child, a boy 10 years of age into the streets unprotected a year ago. Now I have no hesitation in doing so, and females are perfectly safe to go out alone. At any public show, or on a training day our streets used to be filled with drunkenness, now such a day passes over very quietly, and scarcely a drunken man will be seen.

## PORTLAND, MAINE.

Having satisfied ourselves as to the cause in Boston, we proceeded to Portland with feelings somewhat of despondency. Our whole course, so far, had been cheered with the Jubilant song of triumph. The Law had worked to admiration wherever enforced with energy, was working, and was effectual. But in Portland, we expected to see every second shop a dram-shop, and every other man intoxicated. Portland! which a few years ago could boast of five distilleries in full blast,—Portland! which, before the Law, with a population of 20,000, had upwards of 300 places for the open sale of intoxicating liquors, was now, since the Law, according to the published statements of John Neal and the Editor of the *State of Maine, reliable* authorities no doubt, transformed into a huge grog-shop, where drunkenness had nearly doubled, and crime had enormously increased.

It was no wonder though we did feel rather nervous at the thought, that all the sweet pictures of domestic felicity daguerreotyped on the mind as we had journeyed along, were now to be rudely replaced by scenes of misery, desolation and woe. But the work must be accomplished. There was no use trying to console ourselves with the reflection that John Neal, a literary gentleman of some celebrity, who had written some twenty or thirty volumes of novels, and nearly as much poetry, might in his more mellow moments, have mixed up his statements with moonshine, and given them just a *little* spice of romance. That could not be, because although they had been flatly and publicly denounced as false, by some 400 of the most respectable merchants in Portland, they had been endorsed by the Editor of the *State of Maine*, and he! ah! here we were in the dark—though now we see clearly

But judge of our surprise, when instead of going into a modern Sodom streaming with drunkenness, and reeking with all manner of impurities, we wandered from one end of the beautiful city to the other, and never yet saw one place where liquor was openly sold.

It could not be that we had got into the *wrong State*, we had traced our way too closely for that. And yet; this could not be that Portland, which the luxuriant fancy of John Neal and the Editor of the *State of Maine* had conjured up as one of the most ungainly spots on earth's wide surface. It was even so, and so far as we could learn there is not one house in Portland where drink can be openly had.

"There," said Neal Dow, as we drove down the streets with him on the following day,—"there, where that Harness maker's shop is, was a large grog shop; there, the next door but one was another, and in a stone's throw I could point you to twenty in the line of this street; but these places are now filled by honest industrious tradesmen."

Rev. D. B. Peck, Portland.—"I know a number of cases of reclamation from intemperance, as a direct result of the Maine Law, men who were intemperate previous to the passing of the law and have since become sober men. Four instances have come under my own observation, and there are many others in the city of which I have been credibly informed. One of these is a very interesting case. He was a miserable drunken creature before the passage of the law. During Mr. Dow's Mayoralty, he could not get a drop of liquor, and was from absolute necessity forced to go without it. He found after a trial that he could do without it, and he has since become an industrious man, and accumulated some little money. He and his wife are now regular in attendance at the church, and his family, wretched and miserable before, are now comfortably clothed. He has purchased the house in which they now live, and a great part of the purchase money is paid. The other three to whom I alluded have become sober respectable men.

"Since the passing of the law, five new churches have been erected in this city. I remember at the time these churches were commenced, objections were raised by some that it would draw off the people from the old congregations. But such has not been the case. Every old congregation has increased, and our new churches are well filled. The fact is we require one or two more churches.

"With regard to Sabbath schools, I know of many children now attending Sabbath school, who, before the passing of the law, were children of intemperate parents, and were never to be seen at a Sunday school.

"There were about three hundred places here for the open sale of

liquor before the passing of the law. There is at present no place for the open sale. I am satisfied there are several places where liquor can be got, but it must be sold in secret; except in hotels, where it can be had, only by travellers, the others who sell it are vile, unprincipled men, men of low vulgar habits.

"The feeling in regard to the principle of prohibition is gradually increasing. The law has not by any means effected what it is capable of doing, and what it would do in the hands of its friends, if they had it to execute. In almost all our country towns, such as Saco, Rockland and others, it would be very hard work to get liquor in any of them, except from the town agent who keeps it for purposes mentioned in the law.

"I am fully convinced that a rigid enforcement of the law is the only course that can be adopted to accomplish the end in view. The class of men engaged in the rum-selling are men devoid of principle, who are ready to sell, provided they can make money out of it. That class of men must be reached by the penalties of the law. The parties who violate the Law are foreigners, chiefly from Ireland. We have no other foreign population here. They come here, with all their vicious habits and grovelling tastes uncontrolled, and they think they can make money at this thing, and they set to work. They have had no previous training in habits of temperance, and they die out before they are reclaimed. They don't live on an average more than seven years here.

"Notwithstanding all that has been said about the law not having been carried out in this city, I am convinced that there is a strong healthy public feeling in favour of its enforcement. We had two distilleries working when the law passed, and one in process of erection. The one then in progress, is converted into a gas work. The fires of the other two are blown out.

"Our prospect in regard to a new Mayor is good. I have not the least doubt Mr. Dow will be elected by a large majority. One gentleman, Mr. Sawyer, told me the other day that he was determinedly opposed to the Maine Law when it passed, and had spent $300 to help to defeat Neal Dow's re-election as Mayor. Now he would cheerfully give as much to get him elected, as he had witnessed the beneficial operations of the law upon the city."

Mr. Alderman Thomas, one of the Representatives of the City of Portland.—"I think that there is no question that the feeling in favor of prohibition is increasing in this city. Hundreds of men who, to my own knowledge opposed the law at its first enactment, are now in favour of it. They long to have a law that they can put fully in force, and they are determined to have such a law.

"Well you may not understand why Neal Dow was not re-elected, and it will take some time to make you acquainted with all the kinds of opposition brought against him. One thing, however, you will keep in mind at the outset,—Mr. Dow had a majority of the legal votes. Many people were brought up to the poll who had no right to vote, but they swore that they were so-and-so. Some of them were rejected at the poll. There were hundreds of naturalization tickets brought from Boston, and handed to parties who came up and swore on these tickets, and thus the list was raised. It was understood that these tickets were borrowed for the occasion in Boston, and given to people who lived in the country and had no kind of title to vote in Portland.

"Two men, two leaders of a party, who told me they were determined to hazard any amount of money to defeat Mr. Dow's election, said they were prepared to expend from $3,000 to $4,000 to accomplish that object. It was shrewdly suspected where that money came from.

"Then Mr. Dow's opponent was no mean man. He was the most popular man in the whole State of Maine, and was a friend of the temperance movement. It was not Rum *versus* Maine Law, as it was in the election of our Governor; but rather the Maine Law mildly enforced *versus* the Maine Law put right through, as they say.

"I think there is more drink used in the city at present than there was when Mr. Dow was Mayor. There could not be much fewer than 300 grog-shops in the City of Portland when the law was passed, now there is no such thing as an open grog shop. There are several places where it is said they sell drink, but it is chiefly among the low emigrants. That is the class we have to contend with. Even amongst that class drinking was much greater before the law passed than now. There are no clubs, that I know of where young men go to get drink.

"The representatives of the City of Portland are all temperance men. No other than a temperance man could be elected to represent the city. You cannot at the present time elect a rum man for any office in the city whatever by popular vote. There has not been a time in the history of Portland when the Temperance party has been so strong in all respects,—in numbers, in intellect and in wealth, as at this present moment. No party in the city would think of putting up any man for election to any office whatever in the city who was not a *bona fide* temperance man.

"I do not think there has been in this city one single instance of resistance to the law, and I am fully convinced that no sort of combination whatever could be formed by any party to prevent the passing of a more stringent law. Our ministers of all denominations are united in favour of the Law.

"I have had a good deal of business with the lumbering Districts, and I can say that drink is not furnished at all to these Districts, unless in the medicine chest. There was formerly a great quantity of liquor used in all the camps; but, even those opposed to the Temperance movement, do not now furnish liquor to their men. I know one or two gentlemen in that business, who are not with us as Temperance men, but they will not furnish any liquor to their men upon any account whatever.

## AUGUSTA, MAINE.

We proceeded to Augusta, as the Legislature was in Session, to ascertain the kind of feeling which pervaded the Legislature in regard to the working of the Law, and to have a few minutes conversation with the Governor upon the subject. On our way down Mr. Ald. Thomas, who was returning to his Legislative duties, introduced us to Allen Haines, Esq., of Portland, a gentleman who took the deepest interest in our mission, who devoted the greater part of the day to us, to facilitate our enquiries, and gave us a full insight into the political state of the question. The following condensed statement we give from his lips.

Mr. Allen Haines.—"My own impression is, that personally, Mr. Dow has made a good many enemies, as every man who undertakes to reform a great abuse, invariably will. Mr. Dow is ardent, impulsive, and fearless. At the time the question came up in Portland, the people had not got up to the point, that the principle of prohibition and the Maine Law should take precedence of all other movements. It was on the eve of a Presidential election, and the Democratic party felt it was necessary to adhere to their old party organization. But, as an evidence of the amount of popular feeling in favour of the Maine Law, they did not dare to take up a man in opposition to Mr. Dow who was not a thorough Maine Law man. I voted for Judge Paris. There is no man in the State of Maine who has held so many responsible offices, as Judge Paris. I remember, when I was a boy, he was Judge in the United States Court, and Judge of Probate at the same time. He was elected Governor of the State of Maine, at an age younger than any other man ever was made Governor in this State. He was then elected United States Senator—elected and re-elected; and while Senator was appointed Judge of our Supreme Court. While Judge of the Supreme Court, he was transferred to Washington—under the administration, I think, of General Jackson—as Comptroller of the Treasury. Here he remained in this office until after the accession of General Taylor, and being of a different political faith he was left out in the nominations of the party in power.

He then came back to Portland. He has always been a consistent member of the Orthodox Church—always a consistent temperance man, and a Maine law man, when the question was brought up. As a man he is amiable and courteous. He has no enemies, and I am not aware that he ever had one, which is a very singular thing for a politician.

"I am free to say, that when the question of the nomination of Judge Paris was taken up, we came to the conclusion that there was no other man in the Democratic party we could elect as Mayor of Portland, in opposition to Neal Dow. I was one of the party who insisted upon putting up Judge Paris. I voted for him, as did nearly all the Democratic party, purely, however, on party political grounds.

"Our present Mayor—Mr. Cahoun—is a very worthy man. He has been unfortunate in business, and as the office of Mayor has a salary attached to it, he was elected simply out of respect for him in his misfortune. He has at present no other means of support. He is a Maine Law man, there is no doubt about that, but he has not got fire and energy enough to carry it out. He is, however, highly respected by all. He is an excellent man, and an excellent Mayor; and if he were supported by his Marshal and deputies, he would be much more efficient. The Marshal is said to be favorable to the law, but the Deputies are not only inefficient, they are indisposed to carry the Law out.

"Judge Paris was in the same predicament. He said he was not sustained by his executive officers. There were four of his Aldermen which were appropriately termed, "Rum Aldermen."

"There was another influence at work against the Law. About three years ago a paper called the *Expositor* was started in Portland, to oppose the Maine Law. My own impression is, that it was started directly in the rum interest. The paper never supported itself, nor half supported itself, and the general belief is, that a great portion of the money that supported it, came from Boston. Before it was started, the person who did so came to consult me on the subject. I had, in my capacity as President of one of the City Banks, befriended him now and again, as well as in other ways. He came and told me that he had a proposition from some parties in Boston to start a paper to oppose the Law. I told him very frankly if he did so, our intercourse was at an end. I urged him against it, but the bait was too tempting, seemingly, to be resisted. The paper was started, and dragged out a brief existence.

"When the Hon. Shepard Cary started in his canvas for Governor, he went through all the State directing his attacks against the Maine Law, and was accompanied by the Editor of this same *Expositor*. Mr.

Cary was a member of Congress for several years, a member of the Senate House, and had been a leading Democrat for several years. But he was brought out on the Rum ticket, directly in opposition to the Maine Law; and, notwithstanding that he stumped the State, and had the Editor of the rum paper with him heralding his praises; and notwithstanding all his *prestige* as a man, he received only something like 4,000 votes out of a representative vote of 90,000.

"Here again the democratic party stood forward as a party, in direct opposition to the Maine Law, and were defeated. I voted for Governor Paris the regular democratic candidate, and he never was beaten at an election in his life before. Governor Morrill's brother, one of the most eminent lawyers in the State, voted with the democratic party, and consequently against his own brother. We thought it necessary to keep party lines distinct.

"Although we have suffered for the last year or two by the law not being fully enforced,—yet there is nothing like the drinking in the city that there was. We have no open houses for the sale of liquor, but people get it in from Boston in milk cans, and various sorts of packages; but the new Law will sweep all that away. There is no question that the city is much quieter than it was before the passing of the Law, and the sentiment in favour of the principle of entire prohibition is nearly universal."

Leonard Andrews, Esq., representative from Biddeford: County of York, a manufacturing town with a population of about 8,000. "The Law has not been so strictly enforced in our town, in consequence of some little difference in feeling among the town officers. We commenced soon after the passing of the law to enforce it, and in a very short time, we closed up every grog shop in the place. There have been no open shops since. It is however to be had in some low places kept by emigrants. So far as my own knowledge goes, the law has worked to a charm in Biddeford. When the population was not more than 2,000, I have seen as many as 30 places for the open sale of rum. Drunkenness was very prevalent. But now the scene is changed Ever since the law was enacted the feeling of respectable citizens has been increasing in its favour, and no combination of political parties could defeat it if a popular vote was taken on the question. From my connexion with the city affairs previous to the passing of the law I had a good opportunity of witnessing the crime and drunkenness that existed and can now speak of the very great change which was speedily effected. We love the law in Biddeford."

J. D. Prescott, Esq., of Franklin County; Librarian of the House. "At the time the Maine Law was enacted, the county of Franklin was strongly democratic and the democratic party were accounted as

the opponents of the Law. The friends of Temperance consequently organized upon the Law and succeeded by a majority of several hundreds in returning every member to this House and to the Senate upon this issue alone. There were five Maine Law men sent to the Assembly and one to the Senate, so that the delegates from that County are entirely Maine Law. The Law is enforced successfully in every town in the county, and the effects are most salutary; peace and order and everything desirable is the result. I know a great many instances of reclamation from intemperance in consequence of the enforcement of the Law amongst the labouring and mechanical classes. Before the Law, some of their families were living in wretchedness, now they are surrounded by comfort. We have very many such instances in our county.

"The attendance upon public worship has gradually increased since the law was passed. I don't think that its effects upon the attendance at our common schools is so great, as the children even of those parents who were intemperate, were brought out to school, but then there is a marked difference upon the comfortable appearance of some of the children.

Enoch Goodale, representative of Wells, County of York, introduced to us as elected in opposition to the Law, and chiefly on the rum-interest, said:—"The principle of prohibition is very generally acknowledged in Wells. But I think that there is a majority of those whom I represent opposed to the Law in some of its features. Some of them think that a stringent License Law would be more beneficial than the Maine Law, while others of them are opposed to the Maine Law because it does not go far enough and prohibit the sale of liquors entirely and not allow them to be sold even by town agents. Both of these parties voted for me at last election. But there was a strong political feeling manifested. My opponent was strongly Anti-Nebraska and Maine Law. So far as my experience goes I think the operations of the law have not decreased drunkenness, because it has taken the sale out of the hands of responsible parties and put it into the hands of irresponsible parties. We did not appoint town agents in Wells, because the majority of our people were opposed to the enforcement of the law. There were several licensed houses before the passing of the law. Now there are no houses for the open sale of liquor; but I have no doubt there are places where it can be had."

Governor Morrill:—"I think the law is working very well in Maine. We have never had an opportunity to give it a fair trial, for the truth is, since this law was enforced the executive officers have been very much against us. Those not opposed to us have, to say the least, been indifferent to us, and consequently, with indifference on one hand

and opposition on the other the law has not been generally enforced, and no law can be beneficial or otherwise, if not enforced. But wherever it has been enforced it has worked well. In Portland when it was enforced by Mr. Dow, it was potent enough to drive the traffic entirely from the city. Mr. Dow published some valuable statistics of the operations of the law during his Mayoralty which will fully show its happy effects. These Statistics you must obtain as they tell powerfully in favour of the law. Mr. Dow will furnish you with a copy. Since the Mayoralty of Portland was changed, the traffic has revived a little. In all our cities and towns where the governments have been favourable to the law and have been disposed to enforce it, it has done the work admirably. I do not say that you can extinguish intemperance by such a law all at once. It was too much to expect that. But I do say that it certainly most wonderfully circumscribes the traffic and will finally drive it out. We have penal enactments against larceny, but although you hear of thefts, you do not say that these are the result of the penal laws. But unreasonable men when they see that drink can still be obtained in some places say, this is all in consequence of the law. I do not hesitate to say from personal observation that the evil has been greatly curtailed by this present law. The people now absolutely demand that it be made more stringent. But even where the present law has been enforced I can give you a list of towns where rum-selling has been absolutely extinguished.

"In the little town of Readfield, where I reside, a place of some 2000 inhabitants, we had five or six grog shops at the time of the passing of the Law. It was a border town where people came in from a distance, and bought to a large extent. When the law went into operation, we got a Board of select men, who obeyed the instructions of the town, and we succeeded in shutting up every grog shop. In ten days every one was closed, and there has not been one open since; nor can it stay there in the public gaze, any more than a thief could before his victim.

"We chose a town agent, and the select men furnished him with liquor. The amount bought by the select men cost $198; and this has served for the last two years for all mechanical and medicinal purposes whatever; and I think I would be safe in saying that for 20 years prior to the passage of the Law, the annual expenditure would not be less than from $8,000 to $10,000. From the peculiar situation of the town, it was noted as a great place for selling liquor, but now we have cleared it all out, and there is not a drop to be had.

"From observation I can say that wherever the Law has been enforced, such has been the result, and such will invariably be the result of this Law, wherever the people take hold of it.

"The Law was passed by the Legislature in 1851, and the feeling in its favour has been growing stronger every year. The public feeling in favour of the Law was very fully manifested in the overwhelming vote on the election of Governor. There were four candidates in the field. Mr. Cary was the rum candidate, nominated in direct opposition to the Law.—A man long in public life; a Senator for many years, and a very good debater. He took the stump and stumped the State. And yet out of a vote of 90,000 only received from 3000 to 4000 votes. Opposition to the Maine Law was made the prominent feature in all his stump addresses, and yet the votes he received will show how far he had miscalculated. The fact is, no man dare enter the field, as a member for Congress, or any other important office in this State, and openly say that he is opposed to the Maine Law, and have the remotest chance of success. I doubt very much whether public sentiment was prepared for this Law when it was passed, it seemed so stringent,—but that sentiment has been growing stronger and stronger every day, and now we carry everything in favour of the Law by acclamation. It operates upon every interest, and I say, with the greatest confidence, that it has swept all strong opposition away.

"Well, I can only say that all those men who say there is more liquor sold now than before the passing of the Law, state what they know to be false.

"Here, in Augusta, parties would go to Boston and buy drink enough to freight a little schooner; and now there is not as much brought to this place in a twelve-month altogether, as any one house was in the habit of bringing in one single cargo.

"Last year the Stanley House was flooded, where you see one bottle of champagne now, you would have seen fifty. We have a different house now. The Augusta House, now filled with members of the Legislature, was formerly overflowing with rum. No decent man could stay there without being annoyed with the effects of rum. But everything has been so thoroughly swept, that I am stopping there this year; all our temperance men are there, and we have not been able to trace a drop of liquor in that house. And so it is with the people who are here to do business, they find the house quiet and comfortable. When I say this, I may state that Augusta is considered the worst place in the State of Maine.

"We are now making our Law more stringent. In the Senate I do not think there is one vote against the Law. The House stands upon that question in private feeling more than three to one, but they dare not even show that feeling. In the whole House, of 151 members, I do not think there will be 30 votes in opposition to the Law.

Ques.—How do you account for John Neal's recent opposition to the Law?

Ans.—I account for it, and all intelligent men account for it, simply in his personal hostility to Neal Dow, his own cousin. John Neal was ambitious to be Mayor of Portland, and was defeated by Neal Dow, and from that time a violent personal hostility commenced; I have never heard any other opinion given.

Ques.—Are his statements in regard to the working of the Law endorsed by any respectable number of the citizens of Portland?

Ans.—My own impression is, that his opinions on that subject are repudiated by almost every respectable man in Portland. I know that not one of the 1700 of a representative vote which I received in Portland, would endorse his opinions on that question. Even those who voted against me, in order to keep in their own political organizations, the members of the Whig party and of the Democratic party, the hundreds who voted for Governor Paris and for Mr. Reed, would be the foremost to repudiate John Neal's statements on the workings of the Law.

Ques.—How do you account for the virulent opposition of the *State of Maine* newspaper?

Ans.—I account for it by saying, that John A. Poor's affinities have always been with the rum party.

Ques.—Are the statements made in that paper, in regard to the working of the Law, to be relied on?

Ans.—His paper is not at all relied on in Maine, it has neither circulation nor influence in Portland. It is the reputed Canada Grand Trunk organ; is in the Jackson interest, and is said to be supported by some of the members of your own Canadian Legislature, to advocate the interests of that Road in connexion with Portland. Some of the Whigs, connected in the rum interest, who did not like the old Whig paper, the *Advertiser*, conducted by Mr. Carter, in consequence of his taking strong Temperance grounds, started this paper, and in came John A. Poor to the Editorial Chair, with strong pro-slavery and rum proclivities—while our Temperance people, to a man, are anti-slavery. The *State of Maine* was started since the Law was passed.

"In regard to Mr. Dow; he is one of the best men that ever lived; he is warm-hearted, generous and candid; he is, however, impulsive, and sometimes does things which even his friends object to; but you will find him at all times guided by the purest motives.

"I predict that that man will be elected to be Mayor of Portland at next election. No man enters this Legislative Hall, no man goes to a mass meeting, and is received with such enthusiasm as Mr. Dow is. Whatever he says is listened to with profound respect.

## ELECTORAL ASPECT OF THE LAW.

Satisfied from the remarks of the Governor that the returns of his election would show somewhat the feeling of the State of Maine so far as the electoral body was concerned, on the great point at issue, we found ourselves quietly seated at the desk of the Secretary of State, who furnished us a few of the more prominent figures connected with the election. We have already said that the old Democratic party, as it is termed, which has ruled in Maine—with the exception of some four or five years—ever since it was a State—this old party thought proper to array itself against the Maine Law, or rather to stand upon their old democracy, irrespective of the inroad which this principle of prohibition had made on the general feeling of the State. Their party name was dearer to them than the principle of prohibition, and in saying so we include in that list such men as Mr. Allen Haines, one of the most amiable, generous-hearted men that ever lived. Yet, they chose their party line, and in order to succeed they selected one of the most popular men in the State,—a man superior in every sense of the word, and one who had never been beaten in a long political career.—Judge Paris was just the man they conceived to crown their party with success. Isaac Reed, Esq. was selected as the regular Whig candidate; while Shepard Cary came out the Anti-Maine Law and Rum candidate. In this state of matters Anson P. Morrill, a man of considerable business capacity, took the field as the advocate of the Maine Law. He took his stand upon the Maine Law, and the result proved that he had not miscalculated the strength of the public sentiment in regard to the principle of a prohibitory Liquor Law.

The Candidates were Anson P. Morrill, Maine Law; Albion K. Paris, Democrat; Isaac Reed, Whig; Shepard Cary, Anti-Maine Law:

COLLECTIVE VOTE OF THE STATE:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Morrill | 44,565 | Reed | 14,000 |
| Cary | 3,478 | Paris | 28,462 |
| | | Total votes | 90,633 |

PORTLAND.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Morrill | 1,728 | Reed | 490 |
| Cary | 43 | Paris | 809 |

BANGOR.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Morrill | 1,275 | Reed | 320 |
| Cary | 6 | Paris | 556 |

BATH.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Morrill | 936 | Reed | 139 |
| Cary | 3 | Paris | 154 |

BIDDEFORD.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Morrill | 721 | Reed | 107 |
| Cary | 27 | Paris | 153 |

SACO.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Morrill | 548 | Reed | 159 |
| Cary | 13 | Paris | 234 |

| ROCKLAND. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Morrill | 454 | Reed | 211 |
| Cary | 0 | Paris | 274 |
| AROOSTOOK. | | | |
| Morrill | 344 | Reed | 613 |
| Cary | 468 | Paris | 735 |

Here then we have a glimpse at the electoral feeling of the State of Maine, and it exhibits anything but a favour for Rum. Even in the County in which Mr. Cary resides, in which all his property is situated, and his influence centred,—the County of Aroostook—the regular Whig and Democratic parties beat him nearly two to one, while the Maine Law candidate, in a wild tract of country where the voice of Neal Dow was never heard, and where all they knew of the Maine Law was through the opposition of the Rum candidate—Mr. Cary,—even in that wild region the Maine Law candidate comes up within a respectable distance, on the naked issue of Rum or no Rum for the plantations. We proceed to give the opinion of several of the Representatives:

Noah Smith, Junior,—In the Executive Council:—"I reside, in Calais, a place of some 6,000 inhabitants. I was a member of the Legislature for five or six years, and was Speaker of the House last Session. I have taken a good deal of interest in the Maine Law. I introduced the Bill in the House when it was passed. Its operations have exceeded the anticipations of its friends, and it is daily increasing in public favour. Public sentiment was never so decidedly in its favour as at this present moment, and no organization could be successfully brought against it. Where it has been enforced the results have been good without exception, and the only places where it can be said to have failed in its operations, are, where they have had Anti-Maine Law Justices. Our Justices are appointed for seven years and are removed only by impeachment, and such a thing as an impeachment never came within my knowledge. There are to be found Justices hostile to the operations of the Law, but that will remedy itself. The delightful working of the Law is a matter about which there is no question in the minds of those who have given the subject the least attention. Each succeeding Legislature since its enactment has been stronger than the preceding in favour of the Law, and never was so strong as at present. I have not known the operations of the Law produce any harsh feeling, or any alienation of feeling in any neighbourhood, not more so I am certain than the execution of any other penal law. I do not think its tendency is to produce that alienation of feeling to which you refer. There is no man who is at all acquainted with the workings of the Law will say that it has operated injuriously.

"The sale of liquors in Calais is entirely abolished, there is no

place where it can be had openly, I know of none where we even suspect it can be had covertly.

"We are connected with New Brunswick by a bridge, and it is supposed that the parties who want liquor cross by the bridge to New Brunswick where it can be obtained, but it cannot be had in Calais. Liquors were sold to a large amount in Calais before the passing of the Law; and on its passing many people there spoke openly against it, because as they said its provisions were oppressive. Now, no one is found to speak against the Law. Many of those opposed to it, and who did not believe it would work well are obliged to confess that its operations have done good to the community. All good men of all sects of religion unite in sentiment in favour of the Law. This in Calais includes both Episcopalians and Catholics, although in some places these two denominations are either hostile or indifferent. The low classes of Irish with us will drink; but the respectable portion of the Irish are with us.

"One of the earliest seizures and one of the largest ever made in Maine was made in Calais sometime in 1851, when 50 barrels of liquor were seized and destroyed. If any operation of the law was calculated to excite hostility of feeling this was; but even upon that occasion there was no hostility of feeling manifested. The law was enforced and its principles were more confirmed, for the people saw that there was a determination on the part of its friends to execute it. It is believed generally that wherever that is the case there is no danger whatever. Many of those who sold liquor have turned their attention to their other business, and are now better off than when selling liquor. They have far fewer bad debts, and much more reliable customers. The other dealers have given up or gone to parts unknown.

"Take the votes of Maine throughout, and I hazard nothing in saying that there never was a public act upon any controverted subject enacted which has been so harmoniously sustained by the people as this Maine Law."

Sydney Perham, Esq,, of Woodstock, Speaker of the House of Representatives.—"My knowledge of the workings of the Law extends over a large section of the State, and I can assure you that the Law works well. In many places where, prior to 1851, there was much drunkenness, a person in a state of intoxication is now seldom seen. The Law passed in 1851, and in 1853 the people asked for a more stringent measure, and it was granted. Still there are some loop holes in the Law which prevent that rigid enforcement which is desired, and now the people desire,—and the present Assembly has been elected to pass, a measure which cannot easily be

dodged—and such a law will be passed. The Governor—every member of the Senate, and a large majority of the House, are in favour of making the first offence against the Law, imprisonment,—a course which they think will completely break up the traffic. I do not know any place where liquor is now sold openly; but the arrests for drunkenness that are now and again made, prove that it can be got somewhere, slyly. In many sections, when the Law was first passed, the people doubted whether it could be enforced, but from that time to this the Law has made friends, and has taken so deep a root in the public mind, that I think no town or locality in the State would be found to vote for its repeal. Every where the cry is—Let the Law be enforced.

"Several of the towns go so far as to refuse to sell it at all. They say it is not needed either for chemical or medicinal purposes, and, therefore, ought not to be kept. They have no objections to pure alcohol being kept, but liquors they object to. Since this Session commenced, various medical men have been consulted, and they are nearly unanimous in opinion, that liquor can be dispensed with as a medicine. I am satisfied the public mind is coming rapidly to that conclusion."

Dr. Oakes, representative for Auburn, a town of upwards of 3,500 inhabitants.—"The Law has been enforced pretty well in Auburn, and the result has been very favourable. Public sentiment there was rather against it at its passage, because they considered some of its features oppressive—particularly the right of search and seizure. Since the Law was enforced the opposition has gradually diminished, and public sentiment among all the better classes is in its favour. We have no place for the open sale of liquor in Auburn. We have not even an agent at the present time. There were several seizures of liquors made, and almost all the cases were successful in leading to conviction; yet, notwithstanding that, the feeling in favour of the Law has increased. The sellers generally had this branch connected with some other business, and they have turned their attention to that business. So far as my medical practice goes, I think liquor can be dispensed with even as a medicine. I have always been of opinion that it does more harm than good, even as a medicine. I do not say that it is never useful, but I do say that the balances are against its use as a medicine. If a strictly prohibitory law were introduced into the House, restricting its use as a medicine, I would most certainly vote for it."

Seth May, Esq., Counsellor at Law, representative for Winthrop —a town with about 2,200 inhabitants.—"At first we were unsuccessful in the appointment of our Town Agent, but at the last annual

meeting a new Board of select men was elected, and a new Agent has been appointed. We have no place for the open sale of liquor. Before the Law there were four or five houses, but the parties have quit the business. I do not think it can be obtained any where in Winthrop, except at the agency. Drunkenness is exceedingly rare. Four or five years ago, in my professional capacity, I used to have a Justice trial every week nearly, but now my docket will show about three cases annually. Almost all our people are satisfied with the enforcement of the Law."

Timothy Sudden, Judge of probate, resident in Turner—population in 1850, 2573.—"There were seven grog shops in Turner at the passing of the Law. The sale was very great for the size of the place. We have no open shops now, nor have we had for some time. These grog-sellers were grocers as well, and they continue the one business. Some of them were taken up at first for violating the Law, but they were deterred from selling again. There was a struggle at the election of our municipal officers, but the Temperance party prevailed. Public feeling is favorable to the Law. We have taken great pains in regard to education in Turner, and the Law has helped us wonderfully in that department. On Sabbath observance, too, I am convinced it has had a very beneficial effect. Prior to the passing of the Law, two of our most valuable citizens were great drunkards. They are now reformed since the passing of the Law, and are both of them members of a Christian Church. There are several other instances of a similar nature although not so marked as these two.

"I was a member of the Legislature, and gave my vote for the Law when it was passed. In consequence of that I failed to be returned. Having received an appointment in the Judiciary afterwards, I was not so much before the public; yet I know that others holding the same opinion as strongly as I did were elected, and public opinion now sustains the stand that I then took.

"In the town of Buckfield, six miles from Turner,—the adjoining town—we have one of the most marked instances of the good work of the Law perhaps of any town in our section. Before the passage of the Law, there were in Buckfield five regular rum establishments; there are now none. And although there have been great exertions made by the enemies of the Law still they have not been successful in sustaining one house for the sale of liquor. In every municipal election since the Law passed there has been a struggle between the friends and foes of temperance. Last year—for the first time—the temperance party succeeded in electing the entire temperance ticket. Such is now the state of things there, that I think we may reasonably

expect the law to be carried out effectively. The sentiment of the people is now pretty much in favour of the Law.

"I have no doubt that the election of our Chief Magistrate, identified as he is with the cause of temperance, has promoted that cause very much. In the County of Oxford, in which I make circuit three times a year, we have had a struggle in the election of County Officers. Until the present year we have never been able to elect temperance men. Last election we elected a County Commissioner, strictly upon temperance principles, and two Senators and one-half of the Representatives, and gave a plurality of votes for those who were friendly to the cause of temperance. So far as my practice as an attorney goes, I know that actions for personal violence are far fewer than they were before. I don't think I have seen in that town one man intoxicated since the Law was enforced.

Edmund Kent, Esq., Counsellor at Law.—Was Governor of the State of Maine in 1838 to 1841, and was States' Consul to Rio Janeiro.—"Before I went to South America I have witnessed the evils of intemperance in Bangor, where I reside. I know a very marked change upon the place. The Law seems to be enforced there with a good deal of determination. There are no open places for the sale of liquor, although it can, undoubtedly, be obtained. I felt somewhat doubtful in regard to the principle of prohibition. I had a good deal of hesitancy about it, and while absent as I was during the time the Law was enacted, I did not think it could be enforced. But the longer I am in the State, the more I am convinced, that by energy and determination the Law can be enforced, and be attended with very beneficial consequences. It will be much more easily enforced in rural districts than in large towns; but my opinion decidedly is that the experiment ought to be fully tried; and I see no reason why an offence against the Law ought not to be punished as a very serious offence. I cannot understand why a man should step up and say, because I do not think the violation of the Law an offence, that therefore he is at liberty to violate it. If it is the Law of the State I do not see why the first offence should not even be severely punished,—that is to say,—if sufficient notice has been given that the Law was to be enforced. I do think that a large proportion of the people of Bangor are favorable to the Law. Even those, not strictly Temperance men, are favorable to its enforcement, and the feeling is gradually increasing. I am satisfied that if the authorities desire to enforce the Law, public sentiment will sustain them in it.

"While in South America, I met with several English people, and the general impression with them was, that the Law permitted the officers to go through all the houses and search for liquor. Of course this

was a misapprehension, because the Law does not contemplate any thing of the kind. My own private opinion is now decidedly in favour of the Law."

J. T. Leavitt, representative from Skowhegan, was introduced to us as one of the strongest opponents of the law in the House. He said —"I was in the Legislature when the Maine Law was passed, and I voted against it, because I am opposed to the principle of prohibition. I would not, however, vote to repeal the Law, I am disposed to allow it to get a fair trial, because I think it will work itself out. I do not think that you can abolish the traffic in liquors by legislation. I think, therefore, that the Law will gradually die out, and that its supporters will cease to enforce it. I think it has done a great deal of good in that part of the country to which I belong. I use no liquor myself. I believe it has a direct tendency to decrease the traffic in liquor, although it will not stop it. The open sale of liquor in Skowhegan was almost entirely abolished by the Law of 1846. There is no open sale at present,—and I do not know that there is any sold secretly. There is none sold openly, and very much to our gratification too, for the only class that drink was what we call our foreign population. The native citizens of our place are decidedly favorable to the Law, and are desirous that it be most stringently carried out. I think, in some cases, it has not been enforced with much discretion. There was one particular instance of that sort came to my own knowledge, but only one. The right of seizure, if properly managed, I don't disapprove of, because it broke up several places I was glad to see broken up. I am inclined to think that the majority of our people desire a more stringent measure. I want intemperance suppressed, but I doubt very much whether this Maine Law will suppress it; and I think its friends are of the same opinion, because they are continually tinkering at it."

Joseph Eaton, of Winslow, Senator.—"We have no open sale of liquor in Winslow. The effects of the enforcement of the Law have been very beneficial there; and they are strikingly manifested in the comfortable appearance of the citizens—in their dress and in their attendance at church. No doubt liquor can be got, but no native citizen that I know drinks. Those who drink with us are chiefly our foreign population. Formerly we used to sell $100,000 at least of liquor annually, on the Kennebec River. Now we do not sell in the whole $3,000 worth."

J. B. Hill, Counsellor at Law, representative for Bangor.—"I am at present Chairman of the Maine Law Committee, to whom the new Bill has been referred to be printed and introduced. I have drawn up this bill with a view to supply some deficiencies in the bill

of 1853, by making some of its provisions a little more stringent, and guarding, as far as may be, against those points in the former Law which our opponents were ingenious enough to take advantage of, by protracting the suits and appealing from judgment and so on. This, we think, the present bill will guard against in a great measure. We have now the benefit of experience, and have found where the rum sellers,—by the assistance of the best talent in the Courts, and the utmost ability and ingenuity,—have been able to prevent the execution of the law. In some places the law has been very efficient—in other places it has not.

"We have also, in the new bill, put very stringent penalties upon apothecaries and artists who would take undue advantage of the privilege they have of obtaining liquor, and allow it to be used as a beverage. We have also prepared very stringent penalties in regard to Express men and common Carriers, and will not allow them to carry it upon any pretence whatever. We don't prevent the citizen from supplying himself, but we could not contrive any way in which Express men and common Carriers could be controlled, and we just cut them off entirely and say you shall not carry it at all.

"The principal difficulty our people have had in executing the law of 1853, is in the destruction of liquors when the owner is not arrested. The officer seizes the liquor but does not find the owner; and the law of 1853 provides that the officer advertise a reasonable time, and if not claimed, the liquors must be destroyed. Our courts may possibly come to the conclusion that this is not constitutional. A case has been argued, but it is not yet decided, although it is believed that the provisions on that point were not sufficient. To remove any difficulty, in the new Bill it is provided that all liquors, when seized, and the owner is not brought before the court, shall be proceeded against in the same manner as smuggled goods, giving the owner liberty to come before the court and claim his goods, and if he does so and defends his case successfully, he shall get his property again, but if he fails to do so, then he shall be subjected to the penalty of keeping liquors in violation of the law. The form of process for seizure of the liquors, and every other form of process, is embodied in this bill and will be enacted in the Statute, and all forms of procedure in courts, and in the service of warrants, indictments and bonds, are embodied in the law, and we shall declare that all proceedings under these forms are valid.

"One provision I consider a very important one—the provision for the regulation of the agency. I find in many instances that the agents have been great scoundrels and have done all they could to pervert their office. We have now provided that they shall keep an

account of every sale they make, and for what purpose the sale was made, date of sale and the name of the party who made the purchase, and have this book open for the inspection of any Justice of the Peace who wishes to consult it.

"In relation to Bangor, I have lived there since 1835—formerly I lived in Penobscot. From personal experience I can say that the law has operated very beneficially in Bangor and its vicinity. I do not say that the sale of liquor is entirely stopped; there are some men who drink still, but there is no open sale—it must all be done very secretly. The chief reason why I think the law of 1853 was not so efficient as was contemplated, is that it did not impose imprisonment for the first offence. The present bill imposes imprisonment for the first offence, and in all cases the first offence will be followed with 30 days imprisonment and a fine of $20; the second, 60 days imprisonment and a fine of $20; the third, 90 days imprisonment and a fine of $20, and the fourth offence (I don't think we shall have many fourth offences) is six months imprisonment and a fine of $200. All this our legislature is prepared to enact, and I think it will be successful in abolishing the detestable vice entirely from the State. When the bill of 1853 passed, there was a pretty equal balance between rum and anti-rum, but the feeling in regard to prohibition has greatly increased.

"There is much less drink used now than formerly. Our lumberers are very anxious to have efficient men to go into the woods with them, and for several years past they have scrupulously prevented any liquor from going into the camp with them, unless in the medicine chest.

"I have paid for labour, on the Penobscot River, many thousand dollars, and I have never had any difficulty in procuring men to labour, although I have never furnished liquor of any sort to them. All the statistics of our towns and cities shew that crime has greatly decreased since the passing of the Law."

Danville, County of Cumberland, Calvin Record, Counsellor and Attorney at law.—"In the practice of my profession previous to, and since, the passing of the Law, I have had a favorable opportunity of witnessing the change which has taken place in the public mind, not only in Danville, but throughout a considerable extent of country, in favour of the Law. When the Law passed, the prevailing opinion in Danville was, that it could not be enforced, and many of the first attempts to enforce it were fruitless. It was difficult to get a jury to convict the accused; but the enforcement of the Law in other places produced a favorable impression upon us, and now, when the Law requires it, conviction is easily obtained. There is no public

sale of liquor in the town of Danville, and the only request the majority of the people make is, that the Law be made a little more stringent, so as to ensure its enforcement."

Dr. E. Holmes, Editor of the Maine *Farmer*, published in Augusta. "The change which has taken place in respect to drinking, since the passing of the Maine Law, is no less striking than gratifying to all well regulated minds. In many places, to my own knowledge, much drinking and drunkenness existed previous to the passing of the Law, but nothing of the kind is to be seen there now.

"There was a good deal of feeling against the Law in Winthrop when it was enacted, but almost all not only acquiesce, but have become interested in its rigid enforcement. In my opinion, no sane man in the State of Maine would think of repealing the Law. There are those who object to some of its provisions, but the general feeling is, that the prohibition of the sale of liquors, as a beverage, is essential to the welfare and prosperity of the State.

"I think public opinion will very soon demand that no agent shall be appointed in any town for the sale, even for mechanical purposes, but that nothing but pure alcohol shall be allowed, and that only at the Apothecary's.

W. H. McElrith.—"There have been a number of violations of the Law in Bangor; but drunkenness has decreased very much, and nearly all whose opinion is worth asking, have become convinced that the Law has proved a great blessing to Bangor, and that it only requires to be made a little more stringent, in some of its provisions, to banish drinking and drunkenness entirely from the State.

"The Firm to which I belong employed 700 men in the lumbering business last winter. We supplied no liquor to the camp, nor was any used by the men, and both employers and employed were delighted with the workings of the Law. The men work better without it, and the winter passes away much more pleasantly and cheerfully.

"Last winter there were on the Aroostook River a large number of men waiting on to be engaged for the season, and the quiet way in which they conducted themselves was a general subject of remark. It was, indeed, gratifying to see scores of our hardy lumbermen, who formerly were in the habit of drinking very freely, spending their leisure days,—which with all that class are days of temptation,—soberly and orderly.

"This winter our Firm has 500 men out, and they endure fatigue, perform more work, and do it better, than in former years when spirits were freely supplied. With all the lumber merchants, great

and small, the Law works well, and has already secured the favour of both employer and employed."

We give the following graphic answers from the pen of Professor Pond, of Bangor :—

*Q.* 1. "To what extent has the Law been carried into operation ?" Ans.—*Very generally*, as I have reason to believe.

*Q.* 2. "Has what has been done so far been done without violence?" Ans.—Altogether without violence in this city, and I think in our towns and cities generally. There have been a few cases of resistance, and but a few. The Law can be as well executed as most other prohibitory laws.

*Q.* 3. "What has been done with the liquor seized ?" Ans.—There has been a trial upon it, and if it appears that it was kept for sale, it is poured out. The earth drinks it; and this certainly is a better disposal of it than to have it poured down the throats of men, robbing them of their senses, and destroying their lives.

*Q.* 4. "What effect has the Law produced already ?" Ans.—It has put an end to rum selling for drinking purposes, except in the lowest places, and in the most private, sneaking, contemptible way. It has greatly diminished drunkenness. I have not seen a drunken man in our streets for the last six months. At this season of the year, with all our lumbermen from the woods, our Irish and Indians, I have not seen one intoxicated. The Law has made our streets quiet through the night. Very few, comparatively, get into the watch-house. The house of correction has been, at times, almost empty; I know not but it is so now. The expense of paupers is greatly diminished; also the expense of litigation. Hundreds and thousands throughout the State, who but for the Law had been miserable drunkards, and whose homes had been the abode of the extremest wretchedness, are now industrious sober citizens, and their families are living in comparative comfort.

*Q.* 5. "Has the Law been injurious to the friendly relations of society, so as to be injurious rather than beneficial, on the whole ?" Ans. Not at all. There is as much friendship among families and neighbors, under the operation of the Law, as there was before, and probably more so. The Law does not interfere with families. Dwelling-houses are not liable to be searched, unless there is strong presumptive evidence that liquor is kept in them for sale.

*Q.* 6. "Will the Law, in your opinion, be repealed ?" Ans.—I hink not. I hope not. It is a good Law for us. Its influence is good—all good; and so I think our people understand it. I see not why it should be repealed, nor do I believe it can be."

The following interesting and valuable answers from the Rev. Dr. Burgess, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maine, will be read by many with sincere pleasure. In writing to the Rev. Dr. Andrews, under date, Gardiner, Maine, August 22, 1853, he says:

"Rev. and Dear Sir:—To your enquiries I reply briefly, in their order.

"*Q.* 1. Did this prohibitory law originate in the schemes of politicians for other purposes, or did it stand in the Legislature upon its own merits?

"*A.* I have very little knowledge of the operation of politicians amongst us; and, undoubtedly, individual leaders or others, members of parties, may have been influenced by their political interests in sustaining or opposing this measure. But I suppose that, beyond all question, the law originated with persons who were solely concerned for the suppression of intemperance: and that it wus passed because it was believed to be demanded by a great majority of the people for its own merits.

"*Q.* 2. 'Has it justified the expectations entertained in it by its friends at the time of its passage?'

"*A.* What were their actual expectations, I cannot venture to say; but every reasonable expectation must have been more than satisfied. Whatever it is in the power of a prohibitory law to accomplish without extreme severity or inquisitorial scrutiny, this law has generally, in my opinion, accomplished. Those who are bent upon obtaining liquor can and do succeed; but it has ceased to be an article of traffic; it has ceased to present any open temptation: the young are comparatively safe; and all the evils of public drinking-shops and bars are removed, together with the interest of a large body of men in upholding them for their own pecuniary advantage.

"*Q.* 3. 'Have there been any reactions in public opinion, so as to induce the belief that, at a future day, it might be repealed?'

"*A.* In my opinion quite the contrary. Should the law be repealed, which seems in the highest degree improbable, it will be the result merely of political arrangements; but I do not believe that any political party would venture on a measure so hazardous to its own prospects. Undoubtedly many discreet and conscientious persons saw strong objections to some features of the law, and still feel their force. But multitudes who doubted the expediency of adopting it, would, I believe, regret and resist its repeal.

"*Q.* 4. 'Has the law been generally executed, and the amount of intoxication been speedily diminished in the State in consequence?'

"*A.* The law has been, I believe, generally executed, though not everywhere with equal energy; and the amount of intoxication has

been, in consequence, most evidently striking, and even, I think I may say wonderfully diminished.

"*Q.* 5. 'Has the health, wealth, morality, and general prosperity of the State been promoted by it?'

"A. Unquestionably.

"*Q.* 6. 'Has the law been found in its operation to be oppressive to any citizens not guilty of its violation?'

"*A.* So far as I know, not in the least.

"In thus answering your inquiries, I would avoid everything like the intrusion of an opinion respecting the practicability or wisdom of such a measure elsewhere. I never appeared here as its public advocate; and I am not blind to such arguments as may be urged against legislation, which, though it is peculiarly humane in its operation upon *persons*, is so sweeping with reference to *things*. Nevertheless, I am most devoutly grateful for the practical working of the law; and believe that, to every family in Maine, it is of more value than can easily be computed.

## PORTLAND.

Neal Dow.—"I have already explained to you several of the forces which were at work to accomplish my defeat, as Mayor, in 1852; and I need not dwell longer upon that subject, as your desire is to ascertain how the Maine Law has worked hitherto, and what are our prospects in regard to it. I have so much confidence in the Law to accomplish, effectually, the object aimed at,—I am so pleased with its working wherever it has been enforced, and I am so enamoured with the prospect before us, that perhaps my testimony is all too sanguine, for I am very decidedly in favour of its thorough and most stringent enforcement.

"You cannot well imagine all the tricks that have been resorted to by the rum sellers in Boston to defeat the Law in Portland. Of course they thought that if my re-election was defeated, the Maine Law was at an end. I am confidently assured that $17,000 were expended by the rum sellers of Boston to defeat my election as Mayor. During the time I have been engaged in the Temperance movement, I have come into contact with our conservative men sometimes rather sharply, and the consequence was that many of those men, good, honest, worthy men, were rather alarmed at the way in which the Law had been enforced, and they gave their vote and influence in favour of Governor Paris; but even with all that influence if it had not been for the 400 naturalization certificates which were sent from Boston and sworn to by parties brought in from the country for that purpose,

the election would have gone in my favour. The votes stood for Governor Paris, 1,900, while over 1,500 votes were recorded for me. All sorts of stories were published and circulated, about private houses having being searched for liquor at my instigation, and great quantities of property destroyed by the officers while they were searching about for liquor, piercing with their spears through bales of dry goods, and all such nonsense, but even with all that, had a Rum candidate appeared he would have been defeated.

"The statement of John Neal, made in October, 1853, from what motives I will not say, was, in substance, that there was more intemperance, more liquor sold, and more drinking in Portland, than any time before the passage of the Law. He even asserted that there was more intemperance throughout the whole State of Maine—with here and there a doubtful exception—than there had been at any other time for the past 20 years. The opinions he gave of the condition of things in Portland, were calculated—if believed—to affect very injuriously the fair reputation which our city had heretofore sustained. The statements were circulated extensively not only through this city and through the State, but thousands of them were circulated in other States.

"It was deemed necessary for the honour of Portland that something should be done, and a paper was drawn up and signed by the Mayor of Portland, and 433 of the most respectable of the citizens, Clergymen, merchants, and business men generally, denying in the most unqualified terms the whole statement of John Neal, as being most egregiously and palpably erroneous and false, and that this was evident to every candid and unprejudiced citizen. The following is a copy of the paper drawn up at the time.

"Our attention has been recently called to statements made by two citizens of Portland, in relation to the operation of the liquor law in this city and State. These statements are, in substance, that there is more intemperance, and more liquor sold and drunk in this city and State, at the present time, than before the passage of our existing liquor law. One of them goes even so far as to say that there is more intemperance in this city and neighbourhood, and probably throughout the whole State—with here and there a doubtful exception, than there has been *at any other time for twenty years!*—and both give representations of the condition of things in Portland, calculated, if believed, to affect injuriously the fair reputation which our city has heretofore sustained abroad. If these statements had been published and circulated only in this city and State, we should not feel called upon to notice them. But having been circulated abroad, to the injury of the reputation of our city and State, and in a manner calculated to work serious mischief, we feel it our duty to unite in saying—as we do in

the most unqualified terms—that we deem these, and all similar statements, as most grossly and palpably erroneous and unfounded That they are erroneous and unfounded must be manifest to every candid and unprejudiced citizen of our city, not only from the apparent condition of things, but from that very sure test as to the existence of intemperance, the records of pauperism and crime.

"We deem it proper to add, that the personal position which most or all of us occupy in regard to the practical business and pursuits of this city, enables us to speak in this matter from actual personal knowledge of facts.

"Among the names appended to this statement published by the citizens of Portland, you will find the name of Mr. Alderman Thomas, one of our present city Representatives, and President of the Canal Bank, and Nathan Cummings, one of our oldest citizens, and formerly Secretary of the Port, John B. Osgood, formerly President of the Canal Bank, Mr. Jewett, formerly Secretary of the Port, General Fessenden, a man extensively known throughout the country, and many others of our most worthy men.

"The progress of the cause is not only apparent in the election of the Maine Law Governor, but also in the election of a representative to Congress. John M. Wood, a whig in politics took the field on the Maine Law ticket against Judge Wells, a very popular democratic candidate, and in a Congressional district strongly democratic defeated him upon this issue by from 3,000 to 4,000 of a majority. Mr. Wood is a bold, outspoken, determined man, and well known throughout the community to contribute largely in money as well as in influence to the enforcement of the Maine Law. No man I am convinced will be elected to any office in the State who is opposed to the Maine Law.

"The statistics which as Mayor I published, after the Law had been in operation nine months, will give you a very fair idea of the beneficial effects of the law when enforced.

*Extracts from the Mayor's Annual Report:*

"At the commencement of the year, the number of open rum shops in full operation in the city, was supposed to be from 300 to 400; 300 was the lowest estimate; *at present there is not one.* The receipts of these places per day, at the lowest figure, may be reckoned to average three dollars; this for 300 days excluding Sundays,—and Sundays were the best days for such places—would give $270,000 per year!

It may be thought that this sum is much too large to have been expended annually by the people of this city for intoxicating drinks, but it is believed that the number of grog shops set down at 300, and the sum received by each per day, at $3, is within the fact. But if

we consider the expenditure in this way to have been only $200,000, or about $2.22 per day for each of the 300 shops; the fact will be sufficiently important to arrest the attention of every man who has any regard for the prosperity of the city and the welfare of the citizens.

"The whole of this sum, or of whatever sum may have been expended in this way, was entirely lost to the city; no valuable return was obtained from it. This amount will purchase 40,000 barrels of flour at $5 each, *or about five barrels of flour and five cords of wood to every family in the city*, estimating the number of families at 4,000. It is true some persons accumulated wealth by this traffic, but it was not by paying a fair equivalent, or any equivalent for property so gained; but the process was simply the transferring the hard earnings of the labouring man to the coffers of the dealers in spirits—while the victims of their trade were sent to their desolate homes to abuse wives and children who were suffering for the common necessaries of life, which might have been purchased with the money squandered on strong drinks.

"A great many families in this city situated thus a year since, are now comfortable and happy, being entirely relieved by the suppression of the grog shops from their former troubles. The extinguishment of the traffic in intoxicating drinks will not only be the means of saving this great amount of money to the poorest part of the people, but the productive industry of the country will be stimulated to an extent that we cannot at present foresee. The whole of the great sum which was formerly expended for strong drinks by the people of this city and State, will henceforth be expended for the necessaries and comforts of life, with the additional amount which will accrue from the more industrious habits of the people, or will be added year by year to the accumulating wealth of the State."

In another part of his report, Mr. Dow says:—

"There were committed to the Alms House from June 1, 1850, to March 20, 1851, (before the Law,) 252; from June 1, 1851, to March 20, 1852, (after the Law,) 146—difference in nine months, 106. Number in Alms House March 20, 1851, 112; number in Alms House March 20, 1852, 90—difference, 22. Number of families assisted out of the Alms House from June 1, 1850, to March 20, 1851, 135; from June 1, 1851, to March 20, 1852, 90—difference in nine months, just one third, 45. Seventy-five of the ninety in the Alms House March 20, 1852, came there through intemperance—four of the ninety were not brought there through that cause; the history of the remaining eleven is not known.

"Committed to the House of Correction for intemperance from

June 1, 1850, to March 20, 1851, 46; for larceny, etc. etc. 12—in all 58; from June 1, 1851, to March 20, 1852, for intemperance, 10; for larceny, etc. etc., 3—in all 13; *a difference in nine months of more than three fourths!* Committed in April, 1851, 9; in May, 10—19. The "Maine Law" was enacted June 2, 1851, and from the first of that month to March 20, 1852, 10 months, the number committed was only 10, although great activity was displayed by the police in arresting all offenders.

"At the term of the District Court in Portland, March, 1852, but *one indictment* was found for larceny, and that was the result of mistake; while at the March Term of 1851, *seventeen indictments* were found. These results have been obtained, notwithstanding an increased vigilance in arresting persons found under the influence of strong drinks."

The Mayor continues:—"Committed to the Jail for drunkenness, larceny, etc., from June 1, 1850, to March 20, 1851, 279—for corresponding period of 1851–2, 135; difference, 144. Deduct liquor sellers (72) imprisoned in the latter term, and we have 63 for drunkenness, larceny, etc. etc., against 279 for the corresponding period before the enactment of the "Maine Law," *a deduction of almost seven ninths* in the short period of nine months! There were in Jail on the 20th March, 1851, 25 persons; on the 20th March, 1852, 7 persons, 3 of whom were liquor sellers—without them the number would be 4 against 25 of the corresponding day of 1851, a falling off of more than 83 per cent. in the short period of nine months.

"There were committed to the Watch House from June 1, 1850, to, and including March, 1851, 431 persons. For the corresponding period of 1851–2, after the enactment of the "Maine Law" the number was 180, a deduction of almost three fifths, notwithstanding the increased vigilance of the police in the latter period, in arresting persons found in the streets in a state of intoxication."

"Such were the effects of the "Maine Law" in Portland in the short period of nine months, and such will be its effects throughout the State, to dry up the tide of poverty, pauperism, crime and suffering which swept over us; to empty our alms houses and prisons of their miserable tenants, and to scatter peace, plenty and happiness over the land. On the other hand not the slightest evil of any kind has resulted to any body, from the execution of the law.

"Is this a good work or a bad one? Men of Maine, do you wish it to continue or not? It is for you to answer the question by your votes."

HOUSE OF CORRECTION, PORTLAND.

*Extract from the Overseers' Report, for the year ending June*, 1854.

"We felt much encouraged when we were enabled to report that there had been but forty-nine commitments for the year, or less than one a week. But how much pleasure it gives us you may judge, and will undoubtedly participate in, as all human hearts will, to state that the commitments for the year ending with June, 1854, are but nineteen! diminution of thirty. And better still, that for the last six months there have been but seven. This is certainly a most cheering account. With but one exception, these were sentenced to the house for that devastating sin, drunkenness. Remove that evil from our midst, and the cells would be solitary. It seems by the comparison of the two years to be fast diminishing. We trust another year may present a purer docket."

Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, in an Address to the people of Maine, says:—"People of Maine! The GOD of Heaven bless you for achieving such a victory. Many triumphs have been achieved in the good cause, but none like yours. Others have more or less fought with the drunkards, and the liquor sellers, in the way of arguments and moral suasion, and indirect and inefficient, and temporizing legislation. You have followed the most adroit conqueror the world has ever seen, in your scheme of policy, or struggle. You have steered for the capital itself, with all its magazines, and material of war; and these once in your hands, you know the contest cannot long continue. Whence are the arms, and amunition and rations to come, when all the deposits are seized? You have the unspeakable advantage of *making war upon all the supplies of war*, and not directly upon the *men* who take the field against you. You combat with the body of sin and death itself and not with those who are deceived and misled. You do not purpose to destroy those who are misled and drawn to ruin, but to cripple and annihilate the power that misleads them. It is an elevated and noble purpose. When mighty conquerors, and crafty politicians will be forgotten, the laurel on your brows will be freshening and blooming, with a beauty and glory that will be immortal.

I know well what liquor dealers and distillers will say. They allege that their property is taken away, and their means of living prohibited. Very well; but what is your property? It has been applied to procure means to corrupt and destroy the community. Counterfeiters lay out large sums to procure dies for stamping coins, and plates for imitating the best bank bills. Are their establishments to be protected? The erectors of those dreadful places (rightly called) *Hells*, expend very large sums, and adorn them with magnifi-

cence. Must the community respect this property? If an honest man erect a slaughter-house, or a manufactory with noisome gases issuing from it in the midst of a city or town; is this property to be protected? Men adulterate medicines, and Congress rises up to a man, and forbids it, not only by legislation, but by active inspecting officers. Are they not in the right? But—are they consistent? There are hundreds of thousands of hogsheads of adulterated liquor, much of it containing rank poison, over which they exercise no inspection, and submit it to no examination. Is this a due protection of the ignorant and unsuspecting part of the community? Scores of thousands die every year, through the influence of these poisons. * *

And have society no remedy against all this? Maine has nobly said, THEY HAVE. She has spoken with trumpet-tongue, that which eternal truth will sanction. Talk of *property* in the means of corrupting and destroying the community! Why then the robber's cave, and the counterfeiter's shop, where his expensive work is done, is property to be respected! Even the innocent and industrious man, if he undertakes a business which poisons the air, and endangers the life of the citizens, is at once compelled to relinquish his station. How can any man rightly own that as property, which sends forth pestilence and death through a whole community? The plea for property is idle. It is unworthy a moment's regard.

So long as Legislatures pursued the criminals personally, so long they were sure to be met with false testimony to screen them, and abundance of sympathy with them because of their penalties. It took them longer than one would imagine to find out and believe that drunkards, and the makers of drunkards will lie. The discovery is made at last. Maine has now laid its hand on that which can tell no lies, and that with which no honest man can sympathize.

Yes,—destroy it as you would a poisonous well, or a hyena, or a tiger, without remorse and without mercy. Stand between the living and the dead, and stay the plague. Say, thus far hast thou come, with wasting and desolation in thy train, but not a step farther shalt thou advance. Nor is this all. *Retreat* forthwith. Abandon the ground, thou foul fiend, which thou hast occupied, yea, make a speedy and final retreat. We will bear thy presence no longer; and if thou delayest, we will sweep thee away with the besom of destruction.

* * * * * Give no more room for timidity and skulking in this all important business. The people should send no man to the Legislature for them, who is a coward, or a heretic here. Let all the excuses be taken away, and every man be brought to feel, that he will never lay down arms, until the camp, and the

very citadel of the enemy are taken, and all his arsenals and magazines blown skyhigh.

May the shadow of Maine never be less! May she live more than a thousand years, twice told! This is my toast for the *Dirrigo State*, drunk in pure cold water, but more cheering than all that were ever drunk in wine or brandy.

## CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Rev. E. W. Jackson. "Our election comes off in about three weeks, and we have every confidence that we will be able to carry the State for prohibition. The Maine Law has passed the Lower House twice; but the Senate has hitherto opposed it. We have a law here similar to the old Law of Massachusetts of '36, and the Maine Law of '46. It is a prohibitory Law, but its penalties are such as to make it inoperative. Our Mayor, the Hon. Joseph Low, is Chairman of the State Temperance Committee, and is a most devoted friend to the cause of Temperance. The feeling in regard to the principle of prohibition is very strong, and if we could separate it entirely from party politics, we would have no difficulty in carrying the Law. But the old democracy of this State has hitherto been very strong, and here as in Maine they have arrayed themselves against the Law. I have no doubt they will share the same fate if they persist in their opposition; for the old Whig party, the Know-Nothings, and the Anti-Slavery party, have united with the temperance party on this issue. We have already made a very good preparation for the Law, for through the noble exertions of our worthy Mayor, we have no house in Concord for the open sale of liquors."

Hon. Salma Hale—formerly Congressional member for New Hampshire.—"It may be looked upon as a trifling boast to be sure, but I was the first man who carried round the Temperance pledge in New Hampshire. In 1816 I carried the pledge round, and the first day I got about 12 names to it. I have been connected with the movement ever since. We have made a great advance since that time. The first pledge was to the effect that we would not use spirits in our families, nor present it to our visitors, nor give it to our workmen. Now we go for a thorough prohibition. I have no doubt that at the ensuing election the temperance candidates will prevail, because the feeling of the respectable portion of society is altogether in favor of prohibition. The old democratic party, it is true, are pretty much against it, but there have been various inroads upon that party, and many of them have changed their views upon this question, and will help us to secure this measure."

Hon. Joseph Low, Mayor, Concord. "Two years ago the town

organization of Concord was changed and it was constituted a city. At that time liquor houses sold openly and freely in various places. But the city government have succeeded in shutting up all the groggeries, and there is no drink sold publicly that we know of. You may, as travellers, get it in the hotels, but even there you will not get it openly. We have the power to do this under the old Law. Our jail since the suppression of the sale of liquors has been entirely free of tenantry; our pauper accounts have been reduced more than one half within the last two years, and there are no nightly brawls in the city. We have five policemen and a marshal for a city of 10,000 inhabitants, and they have a pretty easy time of it. The state of feeling in Concord is decidedly in favor of a prohibitory Law. Last year my election was put upon that issue solely, and I carried it by a respectable majority. I have no doubt whatever that the next Legislature will pass a Law similar to that of Connecticut or Maine. Our professional men, our men of influence and our wealthy men; our clergy and our judges, are all on the side of temperance; our police records will show that crime has been reduced more than one-half within the last two years, and our Poor House accounts are considerably less. We have a pretty large Catholic population here, but our reformatory measures don't reach them, and we are at great expense in reaching them, for this reason, they go to Manchester where rum is still sold and bring it into their families, and then we cannot touch them. Our new Law will give Manchester a lift."

Mr. H. A. Newhall, Dry Goods Merchant—"I have been connected with the temperance movement for many years. I am satisfied the feeling in favor of a Maine Law is very general in Concord. In fact we will be forced to enact a law to protect ourselves. We are very desirous to forego the privilege of being the grog-shop for all the other States. We are already taunted with this distinction. There is a general movement here among the 'New Order' or 'Know Nothings,' and from all I can learn it is strongly in favor of temperance. The leading men in it are controlled by temperance principles. This, aided by the whig, anti-slavery and temperance parties, will, I have not the slightest doubt, give us such a legislature as shall pass a prohibitory law next session."

## BURLINGTON, VERMONT.

Mr. Moses L. Church.—"I have resided in Burlington for the last fifteen years, and have been most of the time connected with the town affairs. I have seen in this city somewhere about fifty places for the open sale of intoxicating liquors, and now we have not one open house. There are several low Irish dens where I believe liquor

is still got, but we catch them up pretty quick. We made a seizure the other day of nine barrels at the railway depot, labelled to four or five different Irish houses in town, that we had reason to suspect sold liquor. The trial has not yet come on; but one of the Irishmen stated that as it was 'hard times' if they could make a little money selling rum it was nobody's business—he will likely get a different lesson by-and-by. We have four or five persons in jail at present for violation of the law: they were tried, convicted and fined, and in default committed. About a year ago we had a public meeting and appointed a vigilance committee to go round and raise money for the enforcement of the law, to pay Counsel and all other necessary expenses, and you may judge of the feeling in favour of the law, when in a short time we had 1000 names on the subscription list. I was never a strictly Temperance man, but I became satisfied that it was necessary to do something to check the spread of intemperance, and that to get a good wholesome state of society in Burlington we must shut up all the groggeries. I must say that I am very much pleased with the Law, and the more stringent you make it the better will it be received by the community. You will not find a respectable man in Burlington who is opposed to the effective enforcement of the Law. I am one of the Select-men and we have concluded that when this law is thoroughly carried out our poor taxes will be reduced about $1,000 a year. This winter as provisions are very high, we have not saved so much as that, but if it had been an ordinary year we would. There is one thing that presses a little upon that fund that we will bye and by get quit of. If a man is committed for violating the law we have to support his family. But we tell them that we will rather support them and their families too, than have to support other 40 who would be sent to Jail through their instrumentality. All parties who open a house for the accommodation of the public pay a license of $15 a year. You might stay here for a month and you would not see a drunk man in this city. Burlington was in my day one of the most drunken places in Vermont, and now it is one of the most sober law abiding places you can enter.

J. L. Adams, County Clerk.—"I was one of the first friends, and the first advocates of the Law in this State, and in New York State, and I am pretty well acquainted with its workings. In this town, a year ago this winter, the Law was well enforced, and the town was never before so quiet and so orderly as it was last summer. The difference was so great as to excite remark both among the friends and foes of the Law. The Grand Jury,—not composed of friends of the Law,—but a body appointed to note offences against the Laws generally, in their last report say: "We would also say that we feel

highly gratified to find the Jail destitute of inmates; a circumstance attributable, in a very great measure, we believe, to the suppression of the sale of intoxicating liquors."

"One of the strongest and best evidences that can be given in favor of the Law is the fact, that many men who were not only opposed to the Law in feeling, but publicly advocated the other side, have conquered their prejudices and are now among the highest contributors to the fund for its enforcement. We were told that the Law could not be enforced, and that whoever attempted to do so would subject himself to loss, and to the hatred of Society, and every other thing conceivably bad. A few of us, however, took hold of it, and although we met with considerable opposition at first, we found no difficulty in enforcing it ultimately. Five energetic men can enforce the Law in any locality whatever in our State."

"A very painful instance occurred here about a year ago:—A gentleman of respectable standing in Society, but addicted to intemperance, was found dead one morning in front of his own door, in a little ditch with just as much water as would suffocate him. It was believed, from the attendant circumstances, that coming home to his own house late in the night, in a state of intoxication,—as he was too much in the habit of doing,—he had stumbled and fallen into the ditch face downwards, and not having sufficient strength to rise, had thus closed a miserable existence."

"This melancholy circumstance caused considerable excitement in the city, and roused the friends of Temperance to a sense of their duty in regard to the Law. A public meeting was called, and numerously attended, and a series of stringent resolutions passed, pledging the meeting to use every exertion to get the Law enforced. These resolutions were approved of by nearly all the respectable people in Burlington, and they determined to use both money and influence to make the Law effective. Having obtained a long list of names and subscriptions, we said to the officers,—Now these persons have pledged themselves to support the Law by all honorable means; if you don't enforce it we shall show you, at the ballot box, whether we think you are entitled to the position you hold. If you have any extra trouble we will pay you for it; if any one attempts to bring odium upon you for discharging your duty, we will stand by you. In consequence of this stand we have had no further trouble, and every where the Law is popular in proportion as it is effectively carried out. Last week I was through several places in the County, and I found the Law working well. I may say that there is no place in this State where a re-action has taken place against the Law; and there is no danger of a re-action againt the law, for its friends are gradually

increasing, and its beneficial effects are becoming generally felt. These will secure its enforcement. We had one or two houses in this city whose annual sale of liquor was, five years ago, supposed to average $50,000. This last year the town agent of Burlington reports sales for all purposes to the amount of $4,000. In this city the Roman Catholic Bishop participates heartily in the progress of the movement. He is in favor of enforcing it stringently, and thunders against those who oppose it. A year ago, when the law was much less enforced, the overseer of the poor told me it had reduced the poor tax at least $500. It will be more this year, although provisions are very high this winter. Our returns of this kind have hitherto been made in the gross, so that strangers would not be benefitted by merely glancing over the figures; but in a few years the good effects of the law will speak for themselves.

"The law has already rid us of some incorrigible rum-sellers; the lowest of that low class seem to have become resigned to their fate. Some of the members of what has been for the last twenty-five years, the largest liquor house in Burlington, are now contributors to the fund for the enforcement of the Maine Law.

"When the law adopts the principle of regulating the traffic, it becomes with such persons, a matter of dollars and cents; but the moment you make the sale a violation of law, self-respect steps in and the business must be given up. The large house of Peck & Co., said 'We wish to be honourable men and good citizens, and the moment you pass this law we will give up the traffic.' Men of standing in society cannot take any other course. The moment you say to a respectable man that 'Pat Grogger and you stand upon the same plank'—you are not sheep-stealers it is true, but you are law-breakers—you touch his self-respect, and he is forced to say 'I can stand it no longer.'"

Rev. Mr. Young—"I am of opinion that the law is wise and efficient, and as far as one can reasonably expect, effectual. So far as my observation goes, I am persuaded that its operations are highly beneficial—in fact it is accomplishing as rapidly as could be expected the work intended to be accomplished. I think the longer it is in operation the more numerous are its friends. I have no doubt at all of the better observance of the Sabbath, in consequence of the enforcement of the Law, and I am quite satisfied of the greater peace of the community. I have not heard of any instance of hardship by the privacy of any dwelling house being invaded by the officers of the Law. I do not believe that any instance of this kind has occurred for it is well known, as a general thing where liquor is sold. The

feeling of the respectable classes is decidedly in favor of the law. About a year ago I preached a rather plain spoken discourse, urging, as strongly as I could, the enforcement of the law. The sermon was much better received by my congregation than I had anticipated. Several gentlemen of prominence in my congregation declared their feelings in regard to it very strongly, and in such a way as I had not been accustomed to. I have no fears whatever that the enforcement of the law will be detrimental to the peace and happiness of the community. I entertain feelings the very reverse. I am convinced that public peace and domestic comfort will be greatly promoted wherever the Law is strictly enforced. We are annoyed here a little at present by our border States, New Hampshire and New York, but that will soon cease.

Professor Pease, Burlington University.—"The sentiment of the most respectable classes of society is uniform both in regard to the practicability and the desirableness of the Law. We all agree in thinking that the practicability of the Law has been tested here. Our particular location, with a rum depôt on the other side of the lake, has placed us somewhat in unfavourable circumstances; but even with that drawback, the effects of the Law are manifested in the diminution of intemperance and in the strengthening of the hands of temperance men, and encouraging them in their work. I think the sentiment is gaining ground in favour of the Law. A few years ago most people thought the Law was likely to be received with prejudice by one class of the community, those who only occasionally indulged in liquor; yet that class have assented to the favourable working of the Law, throughout the community. There are few exceptions to prevent this remark being universally applicable. Drinking where it is still continued will be confined to the class of secret indulgences which some people will now and again practise, but it will be ranked by the community with licentiousness and every other vice. With respect to its effects upon our own Institution, I can safely say there is a very great diminution in the use of liquors by the students. Some five or six years ago we were much troubled with cases of intemperance among our students. Since the Law passed there has been a great improvement. Though we have no doubt it is still used in a secret manner by some of the students, from the effects which sometimes manifest themselves, yet there is none of it used openly. We find the results of the law in that respect highly beneficial. We have not had for a year past any of that kind of rowdyism, which is sometimes manifested among students in such an Institution as this. These noises grow mostly out of intemperance, for if students drink they will be noisy in some shape or other.

"I do not know a man within the circle of my own acquaintance who is at all doubtful as to the useful tendency and beneficial results of the Law. I have never heard of any case of hardship by a seizure of liquors in any dwelling house. There can be no conceivable hardship of that kind unless the man is a very suspicious character. No upright citizen is afraid of such a contingency, and even if his liquor was seized the law would restore it."

## RUTLAND, VERMONT.

James Barritt, merchant.—"The Law is working well here, and we have done a good deal in the way of seizure. There are some points of the Law, however, that would require to be remedied, if the neighboring States do not pass a Law, because it is landed here by Railway and by Express-men, although we have no place for the open traffic. I think there were upwards of 20 houses for selling liquor in Rutland before the passing of the Law; now we have no place whatever for open sale, although there are places where it is said to be sold privately, though we have no proof as to where they are. The feeling of the community is with us. We are put to a good deal of trouble by the low classes of Irish that are here. We have destroyed as many as 20 places of sale among their shanties, but still they persist in keeping it, and they dig holes in the earth during the night and hide it. We have had about 40 cases before the county court within the last six months. Our select men are all temperance men, and when we have a vote of any kind in any town meeting upon the temperance ticket, we have always over three-fourths of the voters with us. The town of Rutland contains about 6,000 inhabitants."

Hon. Zimri Howe, Castleton, Vermont.—"Our Law has performed all that its warmest friends could expect. Intoxication is like other crimes. We pass a law against stealing, still there will be stealing, and you can only punish the culprit when you have proved it against him. So with intoxicating liquors. You may pass a very stringent law, but it will be evaded. But if once public sentiment is thoroughly roused on the subject, there will be no difficulty, for every honest man will feel that it is his duty to help to bring the culprit to justice, in the same way that he would if he saw an urchin picking your pocket. The Law is evaded, privately, but it has really done wonders here. Our Irish population—some of them at least—go to the State of New York, and get quantities of five gallons or so, and deal it out amongst one another. They are a class of people that you can make nothing of, and they have nothing to lose. Rutland has been, perhaps, as hard a place as in the State; but they are doing a

great work there, and there is now no difficulty in enforcing the law. A great many offered resistance; a man who kept a public house in Rutland prior to the passing of the law, swore that they should never search his house; but it was all braggadocio, he was brought up and fined, and made no resistance whatever; now he has left the tavern and *cleared out*. Public sentiment in this place is altogether in favour of the law. There is no opposition among the respectable portion of the community; the only opposition is among that low class of foreigners who get the liquor into their shanties and drink with one another. I am satisfied that a direct temperance issue throughout the State would give a two-thirds vote in favour of prohibition. We have made several seizures here, and spilled a good deal of liquor, but we have had no occasion to make a seizure for nearly twelve months; the people have somehow made up their minds to obey the law. Take our own native population, and the law is adhered to as strictly in this place as anywhere in the State; but these foreigners slip over to the State of New York and get their liquor, and then come back and trouble us.

"One point in which our Law is defective is—while it authorises the seizure of the liquor, you shall not take the cask or vessel in which the liquor is contained; we cannot take the liquor well without the vessel, but if we take that, we are liable to an action; but that part will be amended. In consequence of Judge Pierpont deciding that one part of our law was unconstitutional, one of our Justices was served with a warrant for causing some liquor to be destroyed, and had to pay something like $40; but I have no doubt this decision will be overruled.

"Our Central Committee in endeavouring to impress upon the people the importance of carrying out the law, after referring to some of its provisions, say,—'if it be said that the liquor traffic differs from other things which, it is admitted, require stringent legislation, we fully agree to it; but the difference, *in every particular*, goes to show the need of increased stringency here; because the evil to be remedied is, beyond comparison, greater; because it is one of long standing; because men are slow to admit the criminality of the business, and because the temptations to pursue it are a thousand times more. Can any man, in his senses, believe that power to search, and seize, and confiscate, is *necessary* to the efficiency of the law against smuggling, and that such power is *unnecessary* to the efficiency of the law against vending ardent spirits. We think not. No man thinks so who really believes the law is to be enforced. The objection that such measures are unnecessary and extreme, comes not

from those who are sanguine in the expectation that a less stringent law will be executed, and remove the evils in question; but from those who have no thought of seeing them removed, and who would prefer the fountains should be kept open, and the evil be merely *regulated* not *removed.*

"With confidence, and without fear of contradiction, we come to the conclusion that the principles which lie at the foundation of the Law recently enacted, *of right ought to be embodied in such a Law;* and that it is the imperative *duty* of every community to sustain it, because it is a duty to give protection against one of the greatest—if not the very greatest—evils ever inflicted on humanity; because it is wrong in principle to attempt to *regulate* rather than seek to *suppress* such an evil, and because it is right, and it is a sacred duty to use all proper means to suppress an evil which can be removed in no other way. Not one of these principles is new in legislation. The most violent objector cannot point to one. Only one of them is new in its application to this subject; and that is the one which puts *this* evil on the same ground with other evils which it is the purpose to *restrain*, and not merely to *regulate.* The *propriety* of such application we fearlessly submit to candid men.'"

Mr. Truebridge, Conductor of the Castleton and Washington Railroad.—"The law is producing a good effect upon our labourers on the road. We had a brakesman, one of the best men we ever employed for such a purpose, but unfortunately he was addicted to drinking. It being a danger to ourselves as well as a violation of the law to keep such a man on the road, he was discharged. Recently they have enforced the law with some determination in Rutland, and as liquor cannot now be easily obtained, this brakesman made urgent application for his old situation; he was refused upon the ground that his drinking habits were such that the company could not with safety employ him. He said the temptation is now entirely removed; the cars remain at Rutland over night, and there I cannot get a drop of liquor; 'I can, and I will be sober if you give me one more trial.' He was taken on, and has kept his word; for the last six months I do not think he has tasted intoxicating liquor."

## ALBANY, NEW YORK.

From Castleton we proceeded to Albany, and there had a very pleasant interview with the Hon. C. E. Delavan; that gentleman—who, as Dr. Beecher so enthusiastically stated to us in Boston—'had carried the whole Temperance cause on his own shoulders, since 1836.' Mr.

Delavan is in close correspondence with every gentleman at all prominent in the Temperance cause throughout the States, as well as in Britain and Canada; and after many years of active, zealous labour, looks back with an agreeable astonishment at the wonderful success which the cause has had, notwithstanding the inveterate opposition with which it has had to contend. 'We have had to fight,' he said, 'every inch of ground with the enemy. Oftentimes we stood still as if further advance were impossible; but we never retreated, and new light dawned upon us to show the outlines of the yet untrodden path. Our struggle has been onward, ever onward, and now the last fortress of the enemy is besieged. Every renewed victory has given us renewed courage and animation to prosecute the struggle with zeal; and with firm step and undaunted heart, we press forward to the final contest, assured that our labours will be crowned with a glorious triumph."

GENTLEMEN OF THE EXECUTIVE:—

A brief Report of our investigations is now before you. We need not say that our time was closely applied. Duty, patriotism, philanthropy, alike urged us onward,—and the mass of testimony here presented, will, of itself, evince the interest we took in our mission. Imposing, however, as is that array of testimony,—conclusively as it demonstrates the successful operation, and the highly beneficial results of the Maine Law,—it is but a tithe of what we might have submitted. We deemed it prudent to restrict ourselves to a certain space, and, in aiming at brevity, selected the evidence of men well known in Society, so that if the question were tauntingly put—Who is the Rev.'d Mr. Seeley? or the Rev.'d Mr. Dutton? Who is Chief Justice Williams? or Allen Haines? or Zimri Howe?—to say nothing of those high in power and distinction—that we should put faith in their statements?—Ten thousand voices will join in echoing back the answer: These are men whom we delight to honour.

It is due to the gentlemen, whose names appear in our Report, to say that their testimony,—with the exceptions therein stated,—was all given extemporaneously. Not only was it spontaneous, but there was no studied effort to weigh the words, to see how nicely they would catch the public ear, or whether their authors would be compromised thereby. The questions,—many of them suggested on the spur of the moment, by surrounding circumstances—were put, and answered off-hand. The answers welled up as the overflowings of a full heart, and were taken down, in short hand, as they fell from the speaker's lips. This will, so far, explain the evident defect in

grouping and arrangement,—a defect rendered more apparent by the absence of the interrogatories, nearly all of which, to save space, have been withheld.

So fully does this Report, in our estimation, exhibit the successful operations of the Maine Law,—so abundantly conclusive is the array of testimony, that we deem comment or application unnecessary; and, pointing to this trophy raised to Temperance,—to domestic felicity and eternal bliss,—did we consult our own feelings only, we would here close our labours with the simple but suggestive inscription—**Circumspice!**

But something more, we are assured is expected from us, by those, who will not peruse this compilation, and draw from it for themselves, encouragement and determination to banish for ever that cup, which brings with it neither a healthy body, nor a sound head, a pure heart nor a peaceful mind. Our own opinion of the progress of the cause, and the appearance which these respective localities present, may be looked for, and we shrink not from so pleasing a task. We have many prejudices to overcome in Canada, in regard to a Prohibitory Liquor Law, and if we succeed in removing any of these, our labour will have been well bestowed.

In so far as the custom of common tippling is concerned, one single remark will convey our impression of the whole affair. We saw more drinking in the City Hotel, in the City of Hamilton, in the space of from 5 to 7 minutes, one morning before 8 o'clock, than we had seen in all our perambulations through the seven States to which we have referred. It had never once in any form crossed our path, from the time we cleared that dizzy height,—

"Where Niagára stuns with thundering sound,"

until in our homeward course we halted at the City Hotel in Hamilton. Even after so short a tour in these Maine Law States, so very striking was the contrast, that we blushed for our country's honour, to see from eight to ten men deliberately and individually gulping down a portion of brandy and water in the few minutes we stood in the public hall chafing our fingers at the stove, waiting the breakfast gong to sound. Yet such was the lamentable fact, and it will explain better than a thousand arguments the precise difference there is between a Canadian City Hotel, and a Hotel in a Maine Law State. No wonder the bar-keeper, as he handed the tenth man the bottle from which to help himself, made the remark, that "they did not force their drink upon any one. If they did not ask for it they would not get it." Perhaps he felt that there was another eye than that of the All-Seeing Jehovah,

bent upon him, and that while he could fearlessly brave the powerful glance of the One, he quailed before the feeble gaze of the other. Such at all events seemed the fact, but the pitiable salvo will not long avail.

For a solution of the doubts entertained, even by well meaning persons, regarding the practicability of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, and the tendency and effects of its stringent enforcement, we refer to Maine. From Maine we select Portland as an example, from the fact that the Law was conceived there, and there had its first vigorous enforcement, and because its operations there have been most bitterly maligned. And we say with confidence that what it is in Portland may safely be relied on, as even an inferior sample of the entire State of Maine. In Portland before the Law passed there were at least 300 houses open for the sale of intoxicating liquors, to a population of 20,000 inhabitants. There were two distilleries in full blast in the city, and so great was the demand that a third was in process of erection. So impressed were we with the idea that there was some shadow of truth in the statements so industriously circulated, to the effect that drunkenness and crime had greatly increased in Portland since the passing of the Law, that we were prepared to realize a picture such as that so powerfully depicted by Cowper where:—

—Every twentieth pace
Conducts th' unguarded nose to such a whiff
Of stale debauch, forth issuing from the styes,
That Law has licensed, as makes Temp'rance reel.
There sit, involved and lost in curling clouds
Of Indian fume, and guzzling deep, the boor,
The lackey and the groom; the craftsman there
Takes a Lethean leave of all his toil;
Smith, cobbler, joiner, he that plies the shears,
And he that kneads the dough; all loud alike,
All learned and all drunk."

Such was, undoubtedly, our gloomy foreboding in regard to Portland; but in that city at this present moment, with a population estimated at 25,000, there is not one open house for the sale of liquor. The enforcement of the Maine Law has swept them from the face of society, and their devastating stream has been completely dried up. What, though five, or ten, or even twenty houses, in a secret, sneaking way, continue to pander to the appetite, which even the fear of punishment cannot restrain? Is that at all to be compared with the sale which 300 houses, in the open light of day, and under the sanction of law daily effected?—No more than is the mountain to the molehill at its base. One would almost have been led to believe, from the declarations so oracularly made, as to the pernicious effects of the Maine Law on Portland, that it had actually produced

a scene of things, similar to that so graphically grouped by the Rev. Sidney Smith, as the result of the New Beer Bill in England,—"The New Bill," says the divine, "has begun its operations; every body is drunk; those who are not singing are sprawling; the sovereign people are in a beastly state." But will ten or twenty miserable, wretched, outlawed dens ever produce such a picture?—we think not. It is only under the smile and sanction of law that such depravity can prevail. It is said there are such clandestine houses: but if so, they are not numerous, nor numerously attended, and their sale must be very secretly effected, for the vigilance committee have not yet discovered their respective localities. The two distilleries have long since ceased their operations, and the one in process of erection has been converted into a gasometer; the citizens wisely preferring the spirit of light to the spirit of darkness. So much for the practicability of the law.

The Law has ingratiated itself with by far the majority of the citizens of Portland. Public sentiment was not generally agreed upon it, even there, at its enactment. The seizure and destruction of liquor, the making contraband a sale which law had formerly sanctioned, and received a revenue for so doing, were points upon which the people had not made up their minds fully. But the law was enforced, and vigorously too, yet none of these evils resulted therefrom, which even good men dreaded, and the necessary consequence is, that now nearly all classes in the City of Portland are in favour of its perpetuation. We could not, perhaps, present a more striking demonstration of this feeling than that manifested in the electoral vote at the recent election of a Governor for the State. Rum and Water were respectively represented by Mr. Shepard Cary, and Mr. Anson P. Morrill; while the two political parties were represented by Governor Paris, Democrat, and Mr. Isaac Reed, Whig. The result was, that while the combined vote for the political candidates was 1,209, the direct and independent vote for Water was 1,728, and the demonstration in favour of Rum was only 43,—that too in the City of Portland, the residence of Neal Dow, to whom was reserved the undying honour of drafting the law, and giving it a few months enforcement. It is apparent from this that the direct tendency of the law is to insinuate itself into the favour of all whose favour is worth coveting.

The good effects of the law manifest themselves in a hundred varied ways. Active industry has supplied the place formerly occupied by the mere consumers of the city's wealth. The streets are now quiet and orderly by day and night; the Sabbath is tranquil, and observed throughout with becoming decorum. Five new churches

have been built since the passing of the law, and they are well filled, while the attendance at the old has also very materially increased. Business of all kinds has been benefited. The grocer who formerly supplied to many a cadaverous-looking customer, a small quantity of tea or coffee, and a large quantity of rum, now promptly meets the cheerful demand for a healthful supply of the necessaries of life. The dry goods merchant finds that sundry carpets and blankets, and warm clothing, and the numberless incidentals to a comfortable home are in requisition, and he complacently bows to the request; for the money, formerly worse than squandered, now goes to make the family respectable and the home happy. In this way have the beneficial results of the law been felt in a pecuniary view by the citizens of Portland. What pen could unfold the unfathomable agonies of wretched despair, daily poured forth from these 300 sluices of woe and death? or pourtray the horrors of remorse and anguish wrung from the bleeding heart of many a poor wanderer from virtue and society, while tottering near the brink of a drunkard's grave?—yet all these gloomy, unutterable horrors, have been assuaged by the blissful operations of this beneficent law. Nor have these blessings been confined to Portland alone; every village, town and city in the State, feels the dread incubus of misery lifted from its heart. Bangor, noted for its rum traffic, gave an electoral vote of 1,275 for the Maine Law, and 6 for Rum. Bath, where rum used to flow freely, gave 936 votes for the Maine Law, and 3 for Rum, while in these places a material improvement has taken place in the peace, order and comfort of the people. If these are facts,—and we vouch for them,—how is it possible that there is more liquor sold in Maine than before the adoption of the law? Or that drunkenness, with its attendant evils, is more rife in Portland than it ever was? It is simply an unblushing falsehood, a libel on humanity.

The reason of the increase in criminal business, and the apparent increase in drunkenness, so zealously and cordially vaunted by Rum Papers, we have explained in the body of the Report. That one incidental remark of Judge Bishop furnishes a key to the whole affair: "Criminal business has very largely increased under the new Law," said the Judge;—and a rum commissioner would at once have put that down as established and indisputable evidence of the failure of the law; from the highest authority too—for Judge Bishop is no mean man. But we saw in the Judge's 104 cases, one hundred and four separate and individual testimonies in favour of the Law. "I had," said the Judge, "in my last term in the County of Middlesex, no fewer than 104 indictments under the new law, and I should think

five-sixths of the whole were convicted. I say, without fear of contradiction, that nine-tenths of all crimes of personal violence are committed in a state of intoxication, and if the source of the evil is dried up by this new law, it is easy to see that Judges by and by will have little criminal business to attend to." This accounts, and very satisfactorily too, for the increase in commitments under the new Law, for the selling of liquor for purposes of a beverage, is now a criminal offence against the State, and severely punished as such; and drunkenness, which before, in many cases, only furnished an occasion for a ribald jest, is now punished as a criminal offence. The statistics of the increase of drunkenness and commitments under the Maine Law, pawned upon the public, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, are, when fairly understood, just so many irrefragable proofs of the efficiency of the Law. If it was contemplated that the mere enactment of a law against larceny or burglary, was to prevent the possible recurrence of such crimes–why the waste of money in building jails? Why the appointment of police magistrates, and judges, and all the paraphernalia of a criminal court? And if such laws have not rid society of its plague spots, why so unreasonable as to expect that a law punishing drunkenness as a crime, was all at once to check the depraved appetite in its dreamy pursuit after stimulants, or eradicate vicious habits, too firmly rooted, or allay the fiendish passions which the intoxicating cup had aroused. The Divine law says, Thou shalt do no murder: Thou shalt not steal. If the law of GOD is daily violated, is it not too much to expect that the mere enactment of man should be omnipotent. But the Law has already saved hundreds from a drunkard's grave; it has made many happy household homes, and poured the balm of consolation into many a bleeding heart. It has restored rights long infringed, and social peace destroyed. It has already rebuilt many a domestic altar, prostrated by intemperance, and fanned the dying embers of domestic love, and it needs only time and a willing, helping hand, to make these blessings as wide-spread as the curse which intemperance has inflicted.

Nor is the Maine Law exclusive in its operations. Wherever there is a community groaning under the scathing evils of intemperance, the Maine Law is happily adapted to the wants of that community. It breathes the "two great laws of revealed religion, called by moral philosophers, the law of reciprocity, and the law of benevolence," and is consequently adapted to all mankind. In no other way could its rapid spread be accounted for. It has been already enacted by the legislatures of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont, Rhode Island, Michigan, New York, Minnesota, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and

Iowa, and is seriously contemplated by New Hampshire. The friends of temperance in England, have pledged themselves to raise £10,000 Sterling during the year to carry on their movement in favour of a Maine Law for Britain; and we much mistake the spirit that has dared the struggle hitherto, if Canada alone, be left to lag behind. The practicability and beneficial results of the Law, its adaptation to all the States of the Union, and to Canada as well, are points beyond all matter of doubt; and it is the imperative duty of all who desire the good of society more than the questionable aggrandizement of a few, to endeavor to secure its enactment. We boast of our noble country; of our extensive resources, and our unexampled prosperity.—Not these alone, nor all that art or industry could furnish form the true constitution of a State,—

"No—men, high minded men—
With powers as far above dull brutes endued
In forest, brake or den
As beasts excel cold rocks, and brambles rude,
Men,—who their duties know
But know their rights, and knowing dare maintain,
Prevent the long aimed blow
And crush the tyrant, while they rend the chain."

The principle of a Prohibitory Liquor Law is not so new a feature in legislation as we are sometimes requested to believe. It bursts upon us amid the wise laws of that sagacious Spartan Legislator,—Lycurgus—who ordered all the vines in the kingdom to be destroyed, in order to arrest the ravages of intemperance. Nor is it unknown to the British Parliament. The fourth Earl of Chesterfield, a man distinguished for sound judgment and force of intellect, said, in his place in the House of Lords, a hundred and thirty years ago—"The use of those things which are simply hurtful, hurtful in their own nature, and in every degree, is to be prohibited. * * If those liquors are so delicious that the people are tempted to their own destruction, let us, my Lords, secure them from these fatal draughts, by bursting the vials that contain them—let us crush at once these artists in slaughter, who have reconciled their countrymen to sickness and to ruin, and spread over the pitfalls of debauchery such baits as cannot be resisted." Such was the deliberate opinion of an English nobleman, who filled with honor many of the highest offices under the reign of George II., and had the evils here so eloquently pourtrayed, pressed as severely upon the Peer as they did upon the poverty-stricken plebeian, there would have been another meeting at Runnymede rather than endure them.

The same prohibitory principle is recognised religiously by about one-third of the whole human family. "There are exceptions, of course, every-

where, but from the shores of the Atlantic, and the burning sands of Barbary, across more than a hundred degrees of longitude, on to the wall of China, south to Cape Comorin in India, and north into the Steppes of Tartary, there is a vast surface of the earth which is neither cursed by a drunkard's home, nor dishonoured by a drunkard's grave; where the clusters of the grape are gathered to be manufactured only into raisins, and men sow not barley but to feed their horses. Buddh, Brama, and Mahomed have banished intoxicating liquors from their dominions. And must the Cross thus pale before the Crescent, and the lie of Mahomed prove itself mightier than the truth of God." *

We are gravely told that such a legislative enactment restrains the liberty of the subject, and breaks down those ancient safeguards which the law has thrown around him. In civilized life, the welfare of society is the supreme law. Whatever fancied rights a man in a nomad state may have, it is simply an axiom of every-day life, that in society, no man has a *right to do what he pleases*, except when he *pleases* to do *what* is *right*. The principle of the utter merging of individual right, in the collective rights, and for the common welfare of society, has its ramifications through all our social system, and seldom is either its justice or its propriety questioned. Let any one who doubts the correctness of this remark, just sit down and consider how much he could do for his own individual gratification, altogether irrespective of the interests of society, before he found himself in the hands of the police.

But such a law will so diminish the revenue that the machinery of government will be stopped in consequence. The objection fortunately is not a new one. "Surely," says Chesterfield, "surely, it never before was conceived by any man entrusted with the administration of public affairs, to raise taxes by the destruction of the people * * This liquor corrupts the mind, and enervates the body, and destroys vigour and virtue, at the same time that it makes those who drink it too idle and feeble for work." Let us endeavour to keep the well-springs of humanity pure, and there will be little fear of the revenue. An honest, healthy, hearty people, are more likely to provide a generous revenue, than a people dissipated by indulgence and debased by vice. A similar lachrymose objection was made in the House of Commons to the emancipation of the Blacks in India, to that made in the Canadian Parliament to the emancipation of the Whites in Canada. "Such a step," said Col. Carlton, in the House of Commons, "would annihilate a trade whose exports amount to £800,000 annually, and which employs 160 vessels and more than 500 seamen. It would destroy the West India trade, which is of the annual value of £6,000,000,

* Guthrie's plea.

and"—oh! doleful thought—"London would be a heap of ruins." Will ye abolish this time-honoured traffic? asked the timid legislator; and humanity nobly responded—yes, we shall sweep it all away. The good of society demands it; and in like manner the good of our Canadian community demands the immediate abolition of the liquor traffic, whatever the fate of the revenue. "O! GOD!" says Shakespeare's Cassio, "that men should put an enemy in their mouths, to steal away their brains!—that we should, with joy, revel, pleasance and applause, transform ourselves into beasts!"

We have thus endeavoured to fulfil the important, but very pleasing duty which you devolved upon us. It is unnecessary to say, that it will give us additional gratification to know that our labours, and their results, meet with your approval,—that this one cluster from Eschol, borne home between us, so pleasant to the eye, so redolent of joy, and cheering to the heart, will only increase and intensify your ardour to reach the Land of Prohibition.

We are respectfully,

A. FAREWELL,
G. P. URE.

LOVELL & GIBSON, PRINTERS, YONGE STREET.

# ADDRESSES

OF

## REV. HENRY W. BELLOWS, D. D.,

AND

## PROFESSOR ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK.

DELIVERED AT THE

BROADWAY TABERNACLE, Nov. 7, 1855,

IN BEHALF OF THE

## UNITED STATES

# INEBRIATE ASYLUM.

---

DR. TURNER'S ADDRESS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

---

NEW YORK:
M. B. WYNKOOP, BOOK & JOB PRINTER,
No. 12 ANN STREET, NEAR BROADWAY.
1855.

# MEETING

AT THE

# BROADWAY TABERNACLE,

NOVEMBER 7, 1855,

IN BEHALF OF

# The United States Inebriate Asylum.

A meeting in behalf of this institution was held in the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, on the evening of November 7th, 1855, Hon. Edward A. Lambert in the chair. Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. De Witt.

The Secretary pro tem., Rev. N. A. Prince, made the following statement respecting the origin and character of the Asylum.

The United States Inebriate Asylum originated in the efforts of a medical gentleman of this city, (J. Edward Turner, M. D.)

By the terms of the Charter granted April 15, 1854, by the Legislature of this State, and amended during its last session, the Asylum is required to have a capital of fifty thousand dollars, (which can be increased to two hundred thousand dollars if necessary), the said capital to be divided into shares of ten dollars each; each share entitling the holder to one vote in the election of the Board of Directors. Ten per cent. of the capital must be paid in before the Asylum can commence operations.

Fifty per cent of its income is to be appropriated for the support of poor and destitute inebriates and their families; the balance of the

income for the payment of the interest (which is not to exceed seven per cent.) on the capital fund, and other incidental expenses.

The Asylum has power to erect, purchase or lease such buildings as may be needed.

The Asylum is to be under the supervision of a Board of twenty Directors, who must be stockholders and citizens of the State of New York. The names of the first Board of Directors appointed by the Legislature, who hold their offices until the first Monday in January, 1856, are the following: G. P. Parker, A. G. Phelps, E. A. Lambert, J. D. Wright, Jacob S. Miller, N. A. Prince, Jeremiah Terbell, C. C. North, Alfred Brush, J. Edward Turner, Z. Pratt, Washington Hunt, E. B. Morgan, Noah Worrell, Henry Dubois, and G. B. Alvord.

An annual report of the condition of the Asylum will be required, which must be filed in the office of the Secretary of State.

The Asylum has power to retain all patients, if necessary to their reformation, for three or six months.

The Directors give their time and labor in founding this institution.

None of the stock taken will be required to be paid in till fifty thousand dollars are subscribed. About five thousand dollars have been already subscribed by the Directors. Application has been made as yet to none except the Directors for aid, in raising funds for the institution.

The Act of Incorporation, subject to modification or repeal, is to continue in force for fifty years, when the Asylum and the grounds connected therewith are to be ceded to the State of New York, to be used by the said State for some benevolent purpose.

It will be seen, that we aim to endow an institution whose object will be to lift up the poor, fallen, destitute inebriate, to provide for him a *retreat from the insidious spirit of temptation*—to bring him under kind, skillful medical treatment—to throw around him the restraints of truth, and thus to free him from the servitude of appetite; for he is free, and only he, whom the *truth makes free.*

It will be our object to connect with the Asylum workshops in which each patient, as soon as his condition will permit, will be regularly employed, thus making the Asylum, so far as is possible, self-supporting; for labor, well directed, is *reformative*, its tendency

*progressive.* You can never redeem a man from any vice unless you give him something to do, and if he is weak, *help him to do it.*

This Institution is for all classes, rich and poor, and is worthy of the noblest philanthropic effort. Ingem truth in the dark, suffering heart of thy brother, and he will rejoice in its perpetual light and warmth, and be jubilant in his ultimate freedom! Give him aid, sympathy, the quickening inspiration of love, and with God's blessing, he will at length stand erect, reclaimed, redeemed, an heir of immortal glory.

# ADDRESS OF DR. BELLOWS.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Notwithstanding the immense and doubtless the greatly successful labors of the temperance cause, drunkenness, according to statistics that do not probably reach more than half the dreadful truth, carries off fifty thousand citizens of the United States, yearly—the exact total by these tables being, for the last year, fifty-eight thousand seven hundred and eleven, and for the last ten years, four hundred and seventy-eight thousand two hundred and thirty-nine. We do not doubt the real number to be a million. Consider the immense proclivity of our people to this vice, when the prodigious efforts to stay it leave such a sum of it unprevented and uncured! The climatic, political, and moral causes of this terrible effect, have never yet received due consideration, There is, unquestionably, a powerfully stimulating influence in our climate, which renders the human constitution here extraordinarily excitable, and gives to intoxicating liquors a charm and a peril which they have no where else. Foreigners uniformly assert the less need, and the greater power, of alcoholic drinks here than in Europe. But worse than our climate, is the political and social atmosphere in which our free institutions and our new condition place us. The same stimulus, which makes our commercial and mechanical life of unprecedented enterprise and swiftness, which hurries along our railroads and steamships, and devours the wilderness, gives a fearfulness of competition, a recklessness of haste, a fever of the blood and the brain, to our people, which makes them cravers of strong drinks—vast consumers of rich and exciting food, and of stimulating liquors. Almost all our successful citizens are taxed be-

yond their strength; are doing two or three men's work, and are tempted to inebriety by their exhaustion, and the necessity of keeping up their spirits to the mark. And then, of course, in this commercial *stampede*, there are thousands of disappointed competitors in the race, men weaker in the power of enterprise, but often strongest in sweet and noble endowments, who are trampled beneath the hurrying crowd and left to solace themselves with whatever they can find to cheer or drown their sorrows.

The drunkenness of this country is almost a part of the national character and policy. It may be almost said to be the measure of the cerebral excitability and working temper of our people. The nation is drunk with youth, the new wine of political freedom and democratic ideas. It is a divine intoxication, having its great providential purpose, and its magnificent results; but it is attended by a fearful shadow—intemperance of speculation, intemperance of feeling, intemperance of appetite. Licentiousness and drunkenness are the dreadful weeds that spring up in this hot-house of political and economic earnestness and activity. They wreathe around the trunks of the noble and fruit-bearing trees our tropical soil produces, their monstrous poison vines, and it is almost impossible to cut these down without levelling the precious standards that uphold them.

We have naturally enough supposed that education and religion would eradicate, or gradually anticipate and displace intemperanec, with their own wholesome excitements. But if there be any thing which our experience ought to teach us, it is, that drunkenness and licentiousness are vices which thrive in educated and Christianized communities, at least as much as elsewhere; for education and religion, in proportion to the hold they take of communities, are themselves stimulants, and communicate an earnestness, and create a waste of vital energy, which, without special efforts, will drive those who are under their influence to counteracting excitements. The connection between erotic and religious sensibility is too subtle a theme to enter on here. But in regard to the sway of intemperance in educated communities, compare Scotland with France, England with Italy, the United States with any country in the world. The truth is, that intemperance is usually proportioned to the earnestness of a people's life, to the extent in which any of their passions, high or low, are in-

flamed, and to the waste of their powers, whether in lawful or unlawful pursuits, in virtuous or vicious callings. This makes its prevention and cure a subject requiring *special* as well as general attention. It is not to be treated as a thing growing exclusively out of moral, or exclusively out of physical causes; not wholly as connected with what is bad, or with what is good; not exclusively as a vice, nor wholly as a misfortune. It is a fact, to be investigated in all its sources, and met in every shape and by every method. Education and religion must be depended on, because they not only tend to correct the evils which they help to create, but all other evils, through their light, and the moral power and divine sanctions that inhere in them; but education and religion have their own mistakes; and in this country, before intemperance can be brought within tolerable limits, we have yet to learn from education and religion, the means of moderating the haste to be rich, the exclusive devotion to business, the ignorance of an attractive domestic and social life, the community of the old and the young in their amusements, the extinction of our intense social ambition—which at present waste the nervous life, create horrible dyspepsia, plant chronic excitability of all the functions of body and soul, and make the seeds of drunkenness hereditary in the constitution of the people.

The immensity of the cause of our national intemperance ought not to drive us to despair; on the contrary it should excite in us a livelier sympathy with any and all the means that are now employed to prevent or to cure it. The efforts which a quarter of a century have witnessed in this reformation, are almost unparalleled in dignity and importance. God knows where we should have been without them. But all these efforts leave us with this vast amount of inebriety on our hands. And whatever success may attend the efforts at prevention, I think it cannot be doubted that an immense sum of drunkenness will and must still be left to cure.

It is unnecessary to describe the evil of drunkenness, either for its victim or those who suffer with him. We are unhappily too intimately acquainted with the dreadful wrecks it occasions to make any description of its ruins important to this argument. A dove writhing in the talons of an eagle, a lamb in the folds of a serpent, is not so affecting a spectacle as a human soul in the power of intemperance. That

horrible fate before which the heroes and heroines of the old classic tragedy succumbed, or that iron house of the Inquisition, moving its horrid walls day by day an inch nearer to its caged victim, and in the end crushing him with remorseless but protracted cruelty, are not too dreadful images of the power of drunkenness. How pitiful are the misfortunes—certainly as great as the crimes—of him on whom this leprosy has fastened! and for those with whom he is connected—his wife, his children, his parents. Is the old Myzentian cruelty, which bound the loathsome corpse face to face with the living, more frightful than the fate of the drunkard's kindred and friends?

But now, how has Society treated the drunkard? She has either let him alone, or immured him in prisons and jails. She has been compelled to do the last for her own preservation; for drunkenness is the matrix of crime and injury, the devourer of the public wealth and safety, the serpent that tempts murder, and arson, and lust, and theft, and every other crime and vice, to its daily iniquity. But do we not do a serious violence to the moral sense of the community by this confounding of weakness with malignity, of vice with crime? Everybody knows and feels that a drunkard, though quite as dangerous as a murderer, and perhaps the cause of as much loss of life, is not deserving of a murderer's fate; that vice ought not to be treated as crime. Every time a man suffers for crimes committed in drunkenness, the conscience and humanity of the public are shocked, as much as though insanity were treated as crime, as it so long was. The enlightened conscience of the world demanded the separation of insanity and crime; it now demands the separation of drunkenness and crime. They must both be restrained, but in distinct ways and for separate ends. Drunkenness needs to be restrained a thousand times as much as it is; but it never can be, so long as the criminal police are its controllers, and the jail its house of correction. So long it will lie corroding in the homes of the land, eating out the vitals of families; wives, sisters, children, wearing out their hearts in concealing, protecting, and restraining it. Alas! the sum of misery which the unprovided means of society for the confinement and correction of drunkenness occasions, is past all telling. There is hardly a man or woman present that does not know this from an experience they would shudder to relate. I have seen the day when I would have given the results of

a year's labor for a month's appropriate shelter and skillful care of an inebriate friend. And such friends as one sees hopelessly in the grasp of this vice! the gifted, the tender-hearted, the simple-minded, the otherwise pure and good! And they to be thrown into the society of felons, of thieves and murderers! It is enough to crush the heart to think of it.

I see that this asylum, by the language of its charter,* provides only for the poor and destitute inebriate; and in that I think its idea too limited. All inebriates are poor and destitute, and their friends helpless and alike in despair, without the means of confining them in an appropriate and remedial institution. As well might we make a distinction in our hospitals for the small-pox. Let the rich be made to pay whatever you please for the use of this institution, but provide for their use of it by the original charter. There is not a rich parent in New-York that cannot better afford to drop his carriage than fail to contribute to the endowment of an Asylum in which his own children may find their ruin averted. Of course the poor and destitute deserve our first consideration; but drunkenness is not confined to class, nor are its horrible evils worse in one than in another station.

If we turn from the relief to human misery which our Asylum, considered as the inebriate's home, would afford, to the probable cure of the disease which pathological treatment would effect, we find new and still greater reason for the establishment of this Asylum. Drunkenness is a *disease*, even when it is a moral weakness and a vice. It so disorders the normal condition of the stomach and the brain, that human beings in its power are no longer open to the ordinary motives which affect the will and the conscience. The sincerest desire and effort to avoid and conquer the temptation to drink is, in many cases, as vain as by a moral effort to prevent the return of an ague fit. Whole families are by constitutional inheritance liable to its tyranny; and some individuals are as much and as innocently its victims as though they fell by the cholera or the plague. Now this frightful disease is at least as hopeful as insanity, if taken in time. A very large per centage of those who go to asylums in time recover from insanity; and medical science tells us that probably eighty per cent. of the inebriates would be cured in appropriate hospitals for drunkenness.

* The projectors of this Asylum design it for all classes--the rich as well as the poor.

How few under the dominion of this appetite know how to treat hemselves for it, or think of treating themselves as sick men! They are as much under a delusion as their friends, when they think it a purely moral disorder, wholly within the control of the will. The brain and the stomach, with which it has this perilous sympathy, must be restored to a normal condition before the will is free to follow the motives for self-control.

We need an Asylum, if it were only for the profounder study of drunkenness. If medicine owed to hospitals, and psychology to Insane Asylums, some of their greatest triumphs, what might not the cure of drunkenness owe to an asylum in which inebriety had a thorough, large, scientific, and practical investigation, with reference to its origin and cure

# ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR HITCHCOCK.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

There is something of a contrast between a quiet Theological Lecture Room and this public assembly; and, to a man of recluse and scholastic habits, the contrast is somewhat appalling too. But the religion, whose history it is my vocation to teach, is preeminently a religion of philanthropic instincts and energies. Its birth-song was not merely "Glory to God in the heavens," but "Peace on earth and good will to men." Not as some of the manuscripts read, and Kossuth would have it, "Peace on earth to men of good will," but peace and good will to men as they are, destitute enough of good will themselves, but desperately in need of it from others.

But not only is Christianity philanthropic; there is, in truth, no other philanthropy than the Christian. Athens had no retreat for the sick, and Rome had none, except the Temples of Esculapius, where priests were the only physicians, and their patients were cured by magic, if cured at all. Even Judaism was poorly furnished with humane appliances. The poor man who fell among thieves and got so roughly handled, in going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, had to be carried to a caravanserai, and depend upon an accidental charity for the payment of his bills. Hospitals, infirmaries, asylums are all of a Christian parentage. The Apostate Julian thought he discoverd in them one of the main props of the despised Galilean faith. They are certainly amongst the clearest tokens of its Divinity.

Christendom has now a vast multitude of these public charities; only less various than the forms of suffering which have called, and are calling for relief. Comparing nations, Europe in this regard, has some advantage of us; since there it is, in so many cases, the munifi-

cence of governments, while here it is the munificence of individuals, which undertakes these enterprises of mercy. And yet, considering the circumstances of our case, we have no occasion to be ashamed of what has been accomplished amongst us. We have no occasion to be ashamed for the country at large; none certainly for this commercial metropolis of the country, whose institutions of charity, in number and efficiency, are nobly commensurate in some good degree with her abundant and marvelous prosperity.

To night a new charity comes knocking at our doors; new to us, new to Christendom. It has no precedent to plead, no model to follow. It is proposed, by a subscription of fifty or a hundred thousand dollars, to provide an Asylum where poor inebriates, robbed of their manhood by intoxicating drinks, may stand some better chance than they now possess of having that manhood restored to them.

There is one kind of courage in new and great undertakings, which cuts itself off in advance from the possibility of retreat; as the desperate Cortez sank his ships on the Mexican coast. There is another and more sober courage, which never takes a risk without having first provided against the worst; as the prudent Wellington made his stand at Waterloo with an open road to the Belgian Capital behind him. So this new enterprise offers itself to the public, with all due modesty, as an experiment. If it fails, the provisions of its charter are such that no great loss of money will be incurred. There is no expensive machinery to be sacrificed. The Directors ask no pay for their services, and would commit neither themselves nor their patrons to any extravagant expenditures. At first it is proposed, not to erect but, if possible, to lease the necessary buildings. And then the buildings, when erected, are pledged irrevocably to benevolent uses. When they cease to serve the end for which they are designed, if they ever do, then the State steps in to devote them to some other charitable end. In any event the money invested is solemnly guaranteed to philanthropy; if not in this form, then in some other.

But while the originators of this enterprise thus put it forward modestly as an experiment, they wish it to be understood that their own convictions are very decided, and their own hopes very sanguine, in the matter. It is plain to them, that there is a gap here in the noble array of our Christian charities; that while almost every other form of human infirmity and wretchedness has some benevolent in-

strumentality adjusted to it, some remedial appliance prov ided forit, this one of drunkenness has been let alone in despair, let alone, I mean, as a pathological phenomenon, to be pathologically dealt with.

Intemperance in the use of intoxicating drinks has a Natural History greatly needing to be written. It is characteristically a vice of the Occident rather than the Orient; of the higher latitudes rather than the lower; a vice peculiarly of the Scandinavian and Teutonic races; a vice preeminently of our own Continent and our own Republic. At the opening of the present century, when we had barely started in our career of Constitutional government, it began to be apprehended that we were rapidly becoming a nation of Drunkards. Patriotism was alarmed, Christian philanthropy aroused, and vigorous measures inaugurated to arrest and eradicate the growing evil. For some forty years now has the tocsin sounded, and the struggle been maintained. First, the intemperate use of liquors was interdicted. Then distilled liquors altogether, in any degree, were interdicted. Then fermented liquors. And so the siege was carried on by sucessive parallels, crowding closer and closer to the hostile batteries, until now at last legislation is invoked to storm the Malakoff and take the town. While there are those who tell us that these instrumentalilities are all alike impotent; that drunkenness is a vice, which has its roots in human depravity, which only the Gospel, as dispensed and adminis tered by the Church of Christ, is able to cope with.

Into these debates and questionings this enterprise of the Inebriate Asylum does not enter. It indulges in no partizanship, either religious, moral or political. It commits itself neither to the old pledge the new pledge, or no pledge at all. It goes in exclusively neither for moral suasion, nor for legal suasion. It simply assumes, what no one will deny, that intemperance is a gigantic evil amongst us, not subdued as yet, nor likely to be, by any forces we have marshalled against it; the pest of individuals, of families, of communities; the direct occasion of the greater part of our pauperism, of the greater part of our social sufferings and crimes against the peace and good order of society. And, assuming this, it offers a remedial and recuperative instrumentality, in which we may all unite, with the hope, nay, with the full assurance, of being able to do something, if not to annihilate, at least sensibly to abate the mischief. We would cajole the

public into no scheme of moral quackery. We advertise no sovereign Panacea. We simply confront the evil as it meets us in the street, as it inundates our Court rooms, and overflows our prisons; and we say to all: Come, here is a nuisance which may surely be abated; here are taxes, which may surely be diminished; here are crimes, which may surely be prevented; here are men, now as good as lost to society, lost, we may say, to Heaven, who may surely be reclaimed and saved. We cannot hope to save them all, any more than we can hope wholly to dry up any other fountain of human woe; but hundreds and thousands of men may be saved, while all that is sacred either in Patriotism, in Humanity, or in Religion counsels and commands us to make the attempt. Pledges may still be circulated, papers edited, and books written. Eloquent lecturers may still itinerate the land from one end of it to the other; and the Maine Law, if that shall seem wise and good, be carried in triumph from capital to capital. Let each man choose his own connections, and his own instrumentality, doing his utmost in his own way. We debate perplexed questions with no man. But here is something to be done; not a question in ethics, not a speculation, but a work, and a work in which we may all engage. This then is our first argument for the Inebriate Asylum. It raises no embittering questions, comes into conflict with no man's crotchets, asks no man to intermit or slacken any other instrumentality; but it offers a common ground, whereon we all of us may stand, and hope to accomplish something of undeniable and solid good. Daily there reel in our streets intoxicated men, boisterous and violent, endangering the peace of society in public places, carrying a curse to dependent families; daily the gripe of the law tightens upon them and drags them to answer for their evil deeds. What shall be done with these men? As things now are, we have nothing for them but our prisons. The man, who has been guilty only of a glass too much much, goes in with felons, and takes the chance of coming out again a felon himself. In any case, we must foot his bills, providing him with food and clothing. Is it not better, immeasurably better, both for him, for his family, and for ourselves, to give him an asylum rather than a cell? Which is better—I put it to Christian feeling, nay, I put it to common sense—which is better, the iron wristlets or the silken cord?

Another argument for this enterprise is, that the mode of treatment proposed is eminently rational. It contemplates drunkenness under a threefold aspect: as a disease, as an insanity, and as a sin; and would deal with it accordingly. That drunkenness is each and all of these, admits of no question. Heating the blood, it poisons the whole body. It unsettles the nervous system, staggers the brain, and maddens the intellect. Above all, it degrades the sentiments, smothers conscience, and leads the way to every form of moral evil. It follows, as a matter of course, that the remedy, to be effective, must be as many-sided as the evil it combats. If the bane be threefold, so also must be the antidote. And as for the order, reason not less than Scripture, suggests: First, that which is rational, then that which is spiritual; the sound body in order to a sound mind.

The inebriate enters the Asylum, first of all, as a diseased man. It is not enough to stop his rations of liquid fire. The coats of his stomach are inflamed, perhaps spotted with ulcers; the entire circulation is deranged and feverish. He needs counteractive and soothing medicines as much as a poisoned man needs them. The red and purple blossoms of intemperance call for medical treatment as loudly as the white blossoms of the small pox. The yellow fever itself is not more a fever than the raging of a drunkard's thirst. His first, best friend, is a wise and skillful physician; his first necessity, not a lecture, but a prescription. And the course of treatment must be more or less protracted, according to the inveteracy of the disease. A drunkard's medicine, I remember, was invented some years ago; largely compounded, perhaps, of ipecac, or some other nauseating drug. But it accomplished no great good. There was needed, what we now propose, the protracted and stringent discipline of an hospital.

Along with this treatment for the body, there is needed also a treatment for the mind. Forms of industry should be appointed, the avails of which shall go towards the support of a dependent family. The drunkard should thus be encouraged to recover himself to domestic and social duty; his children's cry for bread piercing the walls of his retreat. Books also should be supplied, and works of art, and innocent recreations, to wake up within him a sense of his finer manhood, and so fortify him against the importunity of his baser appetites. And for this, too, time is required; not an exhortation,

which is for an hour, but a gymnasium, which is for weeks and months.

But, crowning all, there is need of a truly religious treatment; no one man's creed, wherein it differs from the creed of other men equally wise and good, but those grand elements of truth and duty, which underlie all good creeds, because they underlie all men's necessities. Conscience must be aroused from its stupid sleep; and that fear of God implanted, which is the beginning, not merely of all wisdom, but of all safety. Veins once poisoned, may be poisoned anew. Appetites once inflamed, are always inflammable. Tastes, once grovelling, may again deteriorate. Mere pride of character, once broken down, may be forever but a bruised reed. Nowhere is there entire safety for a man, but in the grace of God, which takes him up into the highest sphere of his manhood and makes him truly spiritual. Without this grace, the man who has been dragged up out of the mire, may wallow in it again; with this grace, the Ethiopian *can* change his skin, and the leopard his spots. At no point is there perfect safety for any man one step below this Christian summit of character. Here there is safety. There dwelleth one amongst us, an august Presence walking with us the courses of our moral history, whose language was and is: "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." To this lofty height of character, to this sublime guardianship, would we bring the unfortunate and shattered inebriate.

Such is the method of treatment proposed by this new candidate for the favor of a humane and Christian public. It is clearly a rational treatment, applying itself to the whole length and breadth of the evil to be remedied. It takes in hand the drunkard's body, to purge it of its poisoned blood. It takes in hand his mind, to purge it of its madness. It takes in hand his moral nature, to purge it of its sin.

This instrumentality will not do every thing; but something will it do, and much, to check this frightful waste of manhood now weltering along our streets; much pauperism will it forestall; much crime; much suffering. To many an injured and fainting woman's heart, will it give back the husband of her youth; battered, but no longer debauched. To many a worse than orphaned child will it restore a bountiful and protecting father; weakened but no longer a wreck.

And many a crown may we hope it will add to the multitude which shall finally be cast before the throne.

Now shall this enterprise which seems so rational, and promises so much of solid good, be suffered to perish either in its birth, or in its cradle? There is wealth enough in New York and to spare, for any and every object which can show itself to be really needed. There is also intelligence enough, and Christian character enough, to ensure to each object a candid hearing. We must therefore believe that this enterprise will go on, and take its place amongst the most conspicuous and useful of our public charities.

# ADDRESS OF DR. TURNER.

GENTLEMEN :—

It is our purpose to lay before you the history and pathology of inebriety. We shall speak of its destructive influence upon nations and individuals, and present the method of treatment proposed by this Asylum.

Inebriety is the first disease of which we have any record. It dates its existence from the birth of the grape, the formation of wine from which was one of the first discoveries of man. We find nothing in the medical records of the Egyptians to prove that it was recognized as a disease. Æsculapius, Hippocrates, and Galen are likewise silent on the subject. Yet we have for the recorder of the pathology of inebriety the most renowned man of ancient or modern times. Solomon describes the malady in the most significant language. "At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." Thus we have sacred history to establish the fact that inebriety was the most frightful and destructive disease then known; comparing it to the venomous bite of the serpent and the deadly sting of the adder, which have no specific—no cure.

We are compelled to trace the influence of this disease in nations rather than individuals, and form our opinions from the facts of history which records the rise and fall of races and nations. When the seeds of this deadly malady were sown by the great men of Babylon, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, in their Bacchanalian feasts; then the greatness of these mighty nations began to decline, and their chosen people perished and passed away. Babylon, with all her glory and magnificence, fell into the hands of the Persians when her rulers were drunk with wine and her people maddened by the intoxicating bowl.

By Inebriety Egypt lost her ruler, the world her conqueror in the death of Alexander the Great in the thirty-third year of his age. The historian pens the painful fact that he perished through self-indulgence —by a disease "that biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder."

Polished Greece, the grand depository of the arts and sciences of the civilized world, the residence of the historian, philosopher, statesman, and physician, was the first which erected a temple to the god Bacchus. Little did her great men consider that they were dedicating a temple to a god on whose altar would be sacrificed the glory of their beloved country.

The Bacchanalian feasts in the Roman Empire were the cause of her degenerated councils and her weak government. Inebriety was the malady that destroyed the Roman statesman, general, and soldier. Thus Rome fell by this physical and moral contagion, and the dark ages followed in her downfall.

Arabic history proves conclusively that the Arabians were a temperate people. Their philosophers considered wine as the blood of the devil, and that whoever partook of it was devilish, and labored under the most loathsome disease. The Ishmaelite, with his temperate and and primitive mode of life combined with his indomitable courage, has proved to the physiologist that where the disease of inebriety has not been found in a race, there will be discovered a full development of physical power, capable of enduring the greatest amount of labor and fatigue, a mind with energies that know no defeat, a will that can never be subdued.

We have thus briefly alluded to the history of inebriety as a disease through the ages of the world when alcohol was unknown. The Greeks and Romans were ignorant of ardent spirits. They never understood the art of distillation. The method of extracting alcohol was discovered by an Arabic chemist, and was well understood in the time of Gæber, who flourished in the seventh century. The first spirits known in Europe were manufactured from the grape, and sold for medical purposes in Italy and Spain under the name of alcohol. At a later period the Genoese made it from grain, and sold it in small bottles, at an extravagant price, under the name of aqua-vitæ. From this commenced a new era in the history of this important element which chemistry had revealed to the world. Distilled spirits were added

to the fermented ones, which by their combination have brought upon man a greater agent in producing the disease of inebriety than was felt by the Ancients.

We are not able to glean much from history as regards the effects of inebriety upon individuals from the seventh to the twelfth century. The primitive mode of life of the Northern Barbarians prevented them from being exposed to the Bacchanalian feasts of the polished Greek and luxuriant Roman. In proof of the fact that alcohol was not generally known in the Dark Ages, we can state that in 1299 it was sold as a cordial by the English apothecary, and drank only in small quantities by the nobility and the rich. Thus the source of inebriety was cut off, and the prevalence of the disease rare. But where the grape was cultivated wine was drank in the most extravagant quantities. Bacchanalian feasts were given and exchanged and temples dedicated to this god in every city, town, and hamlet, in the south of Europe.

After the religious crusades had passed, and prince, general, and soldier had retired to their quiet homes, they at once sought an artificial stimulus to replace the excitement incident to martial life. Then began the work of destruction and death. Hundreds of brave soldiers of the cross fell victims to this malady. It regarded no geographical line, it pervaded all classes of men: it laid in the grave the bishop who officiated in his solemn rites; the priest who in a humbler sphere announced the truths of the Bible; the statesman whose wisdom was recorded in the policy of his government; the lawyer who presided upon the bench or plead at the bar; the merchant whose ships traversed every sea; the farmer whose broad fields gave their golden fruits to hungry thousands; last but not least, the mechanic and the laborer whose toils produced the wealth of the world, and gave comfort and luxury to the nations.

The last argument which we have to offer in proof of the complete annihilation of races by this disease is found in the history of the Redman of North America. After the sailing of Columbus and his brave associates from the shores of Spain, in the month of August, 1492, a new epoch is observed in the crumbling and wasting away of one of the noblest races upon the face of the earth. The Aborigines of our country (whose sad fate awakens the most painful associations con-

nected with its settlement,) were the victims of this destroying malady. At the landing of our Pilgrim Fathers at Plymouth Rock, 1620, it is estimated that over one million and a half of Indians existed in our land; a people whose physical development and powers of endurance were above the average of the Caucassian race. Thus has passed away a nation of nearly two millions of inhabitants in the short space of two hundred and thirty-five years—a fact which has no precedent in history, a truth for the physiologist to consider, a phenomenon for the physician to investigate.

We now proceed to give the pathology of inebriety in its distinct character. We shall show the marked peculiarities of this affection which distinguish it from all other diseases. Inebriety is produced by alcohol introduced into the stomach, thence taken up by absorbents and carried into the blood. This fluid deteriorated by the poison of alcohol is rendered less or altogether incapable of performing its due offices in the animal economy.

By numerous experiments we have found that the blood of inebriates contains alcohol. These experiments were made in this city, assisted by my colleague, Dr. Gardiner; also in London, Paris, Edinburgh, Vienna, Berlin, Copenhagen, and St. Petersburgh.

The acute form of this disease attacks the brain, producing a stupor of the mind, vertigo, sickness at the stomach, and coldness of the extremities. A deathly pallor of the countenance is observable in some cases; in others the face is flushed, the brain loaded with blood. To illustrate the acute form of this disease, its causes and its results, I will mention a festival given in Russia (when I was visiting that highly interesting country in the year 1850,) by a prince who had gained great favor among the nobility for his magnificent entertainments. To this great feast I was invited, through the politeness of this accomplished and liberal specimen of Russian noblemen. The company was composed of ladies and gentlemen who represented nearly every country in Christendom. This feast begun at the early hour of six in the evening and lasted until three in the morning. Such was the extravagant indulgence in wines and brandies, that out of the party of five hundred present four died from an immediate congestion of the brain, and a great number had milder attacks, which confined then to their homes and beds for a number of days. I

was told by a distinguished Russian physician that such terminations of these Bacchanalian jubilees was not uncommon among the princes of Russia, and that the most serious results to life and health followed.

I will cite an incident further illustrating this stage of the disease. It is one familiar to every New-Yorker, as it excited much attention at the time, calling out many articles from the leading journals of the day, and causing much discussion as to the proper ventilation of our city prisons. In the month of April, 1853, six men were arrested in one of the lower streets of our city, who had been drinking for a wager until by their excesses they were reduced to a state of unconsciousness (or as we would style it, laboring under an acute attack of inebri, ety). These men were conveyed to the Tombs and placed together in a cell, where they remained for the night. In the morning the keeper of the prison in the line of his duty made a call at the cell where these men were confined. He unlocked the iron door and beheld an appalling spectacle. Four lifeless bodies, and the remaining two in a state of great exhaustion. One of these soon after died. An inquest was held over these bodies, and from post mortem examinations made a highly congested state of the brain was discovered, proving that these men died from an *acute attack of inebriety*, rather than from an infected state of the atmosphere.

Since my attention has been specially directed to the investigation of the Pathology and Morbid Anatomy of Inebriety, I have had opportunities of witnessing this disease in all its forms and in every variety of constitution and temperament. But the limits of this paper do not admit a prolixity of detail. I therefore mention another case only illustrating the effects of an acute attack as it manifests itself in the Brain and Stomach. While in London in 1851, in the month of October, a case occurred at my lodgings, in the person of a member of the family, who was suspected of having taken poison. I was hastily summoned to attend the patient, and on my arrival found a vigorous and athletic man about thirty years of age apparently in the agonies of dissolution. On my approaching the first fact noticed was the peculiar odor of ardent spirits emanating from the breath. His face was pale and contracted. I forthwith resorted to the stomach-pump, but owing to the almost Tetanic rigidity of the muscles of the

jaws, and the struggles of the patient, was unable to succeed in introducing it. Time was precious and other powerful measures were made use of but in vain. The man now lay in a comatose state, breathing stertorously. Powerful convulsions soon followed, terminating life. Thus died in the space of forty minutes from an acute attack of Inebriety, one whom a few hours before I had beheld in the beauty and vigor of manhood. This person was not in the habit of indulging in intoxicating beverages, but of late, owing to losses in business, had in a measure given way to despondency. Yet nothing unusual had been observed in his general habits until that fatal evening when he returned home earlier than usual and betook himself to his room and bed and was discovered as mentioned. On examination of the room an empty bottle was discovered in the bed that was known to have contained eight ounces of alcohol. He had evidently taken the whole at once. By the permission of his friends I was permitted six hours after death, to examine the body, which I did in company with another physician. On opening the stomach we found about four ounces of fluid, which we preserved and afterwards analyzed, extracting from the same an ounce of pure alcohol. The mucous membrane throughout the stomach was of a cherry red color, the effects of active congestion. The alimentary canal was next examined throughout. The liver, pancreas, spleen, gall bladder, kidneys and bladder of urine were found in a comparatively healthy condition, save that the spleen was engorged with blood. The mucous membrane of the duodenum was much redder than natural, having participated in the active congestion of the stomach. The lungs and brain were next dissected. No morbid appearances were found in the former, but the latter exhibited tokens of the most active congestion; its vessels were crowded with blood, yet none was found extra-vasated as generally seen in cases of pure apoplexy, showing that death is produced in cases of this kind not only from a pressure on the brain but also more particularly from the specific virus of Alcohol circulating in the mass of the blood determined to the cerebral vessels. From blood taken from the vessels of the brain, a quantity of hydrogen gas was collected which burnt on the application of flame. Having taken so large a quantity of fluid from the stomach, we were enabled carefully to apply tha tests for different poisons, but none was found. Death

had been produced in this case solely from the effects of Alcohol.

In tracing the progress of this disease we pass from the acute to the chronic form, and review the characteristic symptoms and derangements as they appear in the body, which are as follows : Indigestion with lack of appetite, costiveness or a lax state of the bowels, with slimy and bloody stools, a diseased state of the kidneys and bladder, indicated by mucous discharges, cold extremities, manifesting a lack of general circulation of the blood, a bloated countenance, swollen limbs and a dropsical body, demonstrations of a torpid state of the absorbents, a fullness in the region of the liver, denoting an enlargement of that organ, a hard and dry cough, manifesting an inflammation of the breathing apparatus, large and indolent blotches or ulcerated sores upon the skin, revealing an impurity of the blood, a morbid state of the gall bladder, producing a jaundiced hue of the skin, palpitation of the heart indicating an abnormal action of this great engine of life-moving power. The wild and delirious state of the mind, manifesting a fearful change in the healthy action of the brain, defective vision, hearing, taste and smell, proving that the special nerves have lost their power of communication from the outward world to the inner man, and lastly we find it pervades the nervous system and produces a complete prostration of its important functions. Thus is the medium of communication between the mind and body destroyed. In other words it cuts off the wires, knocks down the poles, and annihilates the electric current between the body and soul. It weakens the nerves of sense, paralyzes those of motion, and makes the body no longer the obedient servant of the will, but sends it tenantless abroad into the world a wandering maniac or a stupified and almost lifeless idiot.

The morbid appearances of the brain in chronic inebriety are set forth in the following case. Jonas Carter, a laborer, aged 54, who had been a hard drinker for 20 years, was seized with a violent pain in the head which confined him to bed. I was called in one hour after the attack. I found symptoms of phrenitis present. His eyes were red and had a furious expression, rolling constantly with a wild glare. His face was tumid, the carotid and temporal arteries pulsating strongly. His skin was hot and parched, the pulse at the wrist strong and full and the bowels costive. I prescribed for the patient and on calling twenty-four hours

afterwards found that the stage of excitement had given place to prostration indicated by muscular relaxation and a feeble pulse. The man sank rapidly and died the next day. The body was examined. I found that the stomach and liver bore traces of recent inflammation. A small quantity of serum existed in the cavity of the chest, also in the pericardium. But the brain afforded conspicuous manifestations of disease. The dura-mater adhered very strongly to the skull and was detached with difficulty. On the internal surface of this membrane a thin layer of coaguable lymph was found, having the appearance of an adventitious membrane. The veins of the pia-mater were turgid with blood. The substance of the brain was much firmer and tougher than in a normal state. The ventricles somewhat enlarged containing a small quantity of serum. The remaining internal organs were healthy in appearance.

The morbid appearances of the heart in chronic inebriety are demonstrated by the following case. Louis Trevor, a gilder, forty-seven years of age, an immoderate drinker for thirteen years, consulted me complaining of a palpitation of the heart to which he had been subject for three years. He stated also that he was always worse after eating. I gave him advice, and saw him no more until seven months afterwards, when I was called to his house. Found him sitting up reclining his head forward upon the back of a chair, having been unable to assume a recumbent posture. He stated that he had not been able to sleep since the attack, twenty-four hours previous. The symptoms present were a bloated face, an anxious cast of countenance, a short, dry cough, attended with no expectoration, a feeble and intermitting pulse, and at intervals, a violent palpitation of the heart. His legs were cold and somewhat swollen. I saw him daily, but was unable to check the progress of the disease. His legs had now become dropsical and he failed very fast, the pulsations of the heart were so forcible on the day of his death (the eighth from the attack) as to shake his whole body violently. On inspection post-mortem the abdominal viscera were sound. The heart was much enlarged and several ounces of serum were effused in the pericardium. This membrane gave evidence of inflammation being glued to the heart in several places. A pint of fluid was found in the cavity of the thorax. No other morbid conditions were observed in the body.

## THE STOMACH.

Active inflammation of this organ ending in disorganization and death is rarely met with as the result of an acute attack of inebriety. I have seen only three cases that gave proof of this fact by dissection. On the other hand the stomach is somewhat liable to disorganization in the chronic form of this disease. Nor is this remarkable when we consider the numerous congestions following every dram of ardent spirits introduced into its cavity. Lashed into fury and goaded to desperation from time to time by the spur of alcohol, it staggers under its burden and at last ceases to perform its functions. The following case illustrates its morbid appearance. Mark Satterly, a bookbinder, aged 35, a brandy drinker for fourteen years, requested advice. He complained of an uneasy sensation at the pit of the stomach, was affected occasionally with nausea, in short, gave the usual symptoms of incipient dyspepsia. These sensations had been present for three years. I gave him advice and a prescription which alleviated his distress for a time. I saw nothing further of him for four months, when I was called in by the attending physician. I learned that he had been relieved in a measure by my advice and was comparatively well until two weeks after, when the old symptoms returned and he began to grow worse. His condition now was as follows. He had an obstinate costiveness and frequent and violent vomitings of a dark colored fluid. His whole body was bathed with a cold, clammy perspiration. Continued singultus was present. His pulse was one hundred and small. Four hours after, found the patient in the articulo-mortis. His eyes were fixed, his countenence shrunken, and pulse intermitting. He breathed his last 25 minutes after my arrival.

Eight hours after death, in the presence of the attending physician, I examined the body. I found (contrary to my expectation) the liver sound yet somewhat enlarged. The brain, lungs and heart gave no evidence of organic disease. Neither did the rest of the viscera save the stomach. The internal tunic of this organ was much thickened in its whole extent and of a slate color which I have never observed except in the stomach of inebriates. Near the Pyloric orifice were several foul looking ulcers, two of which had nearly penetrated the entire thickness of the stomach.

## THE LIVER.

The liver is a viscus extremely subject to a disease induced by a long course of indulgence in intoxicating beverages.

The venous blood of the body highly charged with alcohol arrives at the laboratory of the liver, where is manufactured vitiated bile, unfitted to assist or promote a normal digestion. Repeated congestions of contaminated blood diffused in its circulation through the parenchyma of the liver disorder its function, and at last end in a disorganizaton of its structure. This is illustrated by the many dissections I have made of those who have died from disease of the liver produced entirely by inebriety. The morbid lesions discovered by dissections are illustrated, viz: The first morbid appearance of the liver noticed is its enlargement and induration. We find also a species of tubercle diffused throughout its whole substance. These anomalous productions are of a brown color, and on section have something of a granulated appearance. They vary in size, but most generally are of the bulk of a pea. They have no connection with a scrofulous state of the system, but are evidently the result of a slow process of disease produced in the liver from the alcoholic state of the blood present in the chronic stage of inebriety,

## THE LUNGS.

Since I have been investigating the morbid anatomy and pathology of inebriety, I have observed an emaciation of body frequently attendant upon the chronic form of this disease, which I have not been able to account for satisfactorily in all cases on the theory of defective nutrition; for in many dissections I have not only found the digestive apparatus free from organic lesion, but in a healthy state, capable of having performed its normal function (the assimilation of nutriment).

From minute microscopic examinations of different organs to account for the causes of this wasting of the body, I turned the glass to the lungs, where I discovered minute granular bodies, of a firm texture, and identical in character with those already described in the liver. These bodies were found in some cases clustered together, more often separate, and embedded in the vescicles of the lungs. I have frequently found them present to the number of several hundred. Their favorite seat is in the lower lobes, yet in several cases they have been seen

in the summit of the lungs. That they are not allied in their nature to any species of scrofulous tubercle, is demonstrated by the fact that they never soften or suppurate. I have sometimes found them present in the lungs and liver at the same time (or in the same subject); but this is not often the case, for when they abound in the former they are generally absent in the latter.

These morbid products generated from alcoholic blood, are a source of great irritation to the delicate structure of the lungs, and by lessening the diameter of its air-cells, render the organ incapable of performing its due office in the ventilation of the blood. This fluid therefore being surcharged with noxious gases creates in its circulation through the system a species of hectic fever, which saps the vital energies of the system and ultimately leads to the death of the body.

In order to demonstrate the fact that the species of tubercle (I refer to) has its origin from an alcoholic *virus* in the blood, I instituted a series of experiments upon domestic animals. Those selected were dogs, cats, and rabbits of full growth, which were forced daily to take a quantity of ardent spirits mixed with their food. To some was given rum, to others brandy, whiskey, gin, or malt liquor. At first I found it difficult for their stomachs to retain this poison, but by perseverance succeeded in gradually increasing the dose up to a certain point. They all began to decline under the use of these stimulants, and one after another died. Those who partook of brandy failed first; next in the order of fatality were the rum-drinkers, and lastly the consumers of malt liquors. This last class were the least emaciated at the time of their death, while the others were reduced to mere skeletons. Some died in three weeks, others in three months, while two of the dogs who had been fed upon ale lasted until the tenth month.

All these animals were dissected. The organs that gave the strongest evidence of disease were the lungs and liver. In the former were found the same kind of tubercle which I have described as found in the lungs of many persons who have died from chronic inebriety.

The livers of some of the animals were much enlarged and indurated. They also contained tubercles. In several, the brain, stomach and kidneys were found much congested. Out of the whole number subjected to these experiments, the comparative results of diseased action in the different vital organs, were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Disease of Brain | 3 |
| " " Heart | 2 |
| " " Stomach | 4 |
| " " Lungs | 12 |
| " " Liver | 18 |
| " " Kidneys | 4 |
| Total | 43 |

## THE KIDNEYS.

This important excreting organ at times discloses, on dissection, organic lesions. Tasked beyond measure in removing from the blood impurities consequent upon a long course of indulgence in spirituous liquors, it hoists signals of distress which, if unheeded, at last hurries the votary of inebriety to an untimely grave.

The kidneys of those who have died in the chronic stage of this disease are quite often found enlarged, softened and of a spongy texture. The substance of the organ on section exhibits the same character as the external surface. Through this degenerate mass the vessels of the kidneys can be seen enlarged in their calibre, and at times crowded with blood. I have never found ulcers present, and am confident that this spongy condition of the organ is produced from repeated congestion, and that alchoholic poison is the main agent.

In concluding organic pathology, I would remark that the affections of the different viscera, as set forth above, are those which have been most observed in my post-mortem examinations. They are entirely different from those found in dissections of persons who have never used intoxicating beverages and require different treatment.

I shall now speak of the hereditary character of this disease as it develops itself in children under ten years of age, as its hereditary tendency is more observed at this period of life than in mature or declining age. The marked character of the disease, as found in children inherited from their parents, is precisely the same in morbid anatomy as found in adults who have labored under an attack of chronic inebriety. Dissections and microscopic investigations reveal the same species of granular tubercle in the liver and lungs, and the morbid appearances revealed in the different organs, coincide with those described in my dissections of adults.

By investigation we find that almost one-quarter of the children under ten years of age, die, in our city, of hereditary inebriety. The deaths of children under ten in the city of New York, for 1854, were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 year old and under | 9,166 |
| 1 " " " 2 | 3,697 |
| 2 " " " 5 | 2,810 |
| 5 " " " 10 | 1,079 |
| Total | 16,752 |

The whole number of deaths of all ages for the same year was 28,568, making the ratio of deaths among children under ten to the whole number as 6 to 10, while in Paris the ratio is only 4 to 10; London, 6 7-10 to 10; Edinburgh, 7 to 10; Lyons, 3 9-10 to 10; Copenhagen 5 1-2 to 10; Geneva, 3 1-2 to 10.

These tables show that in the countries where inebriety is most common, the number of deaths is the greatest among children, and that no other cause save inebriety produces it. The above tables collected in my tour of Europe, are about correct. In conversing with the celebrated Dr. Riggs of London, on the subject of the mortality of children, he says "that one-half of the deaths among the children of our city is produced by hereditary inebriety."

We have fully described hereditary inebriety as it manifests itself in children, and shown that it lays its blighting and withering hand upon the buds of early years, as well as upon manhood, the maturer tree of life. On every family hearth-stone in our land is found recorded its mournful biography of blasted hopes, broken vows, destroyed constitutions and premature deaths.

Every physician knows full well that a predisposition to become affected by certain diseases, on the application of the exciting causes, does certainly exists in the human family, and particularly in the diseases of inebriety, scrofula, gout and mania. In some instances the predisposition is more strongly marked than in others. But where it is inert and insufficient of itself to produce disease, it requires the application of an exciting cause. This is the proper light in which we should view hereditary pre-dispositions to inebriety as we find it in adults. Every family in our land is more or less pre-disposed to this

disease. It may pass over one generation and appear in the next. So the grand-father, and grand-son (the first and third generations) may be inebriates while the intervening link escapes. This phenomenon is noticed by every common observer. Does it then require a stronger argument than this to prove the vital importance of founding in our city an Inebriate Asylum? Has not every family throughout the length and breadth of America *an interest in this institution paramount to all others?*

Dr. Darwin says, "It is remarkable that all the diseases from drinking spirituous or fermented liquors, are liable to become hereditary even to the third generation, gradually increasing, if the cause be continued until the family becomes extinct."—*Botan. Gard., Part* ii.—*Note on vitis.*

Statistics show that the past ten years have consigned to the grave 478,239 inebriates. As correctly as I can estimate by reviewing the number of deaths for 1850, in the United States, I find that the children who have died from hereditary inebriety have not been included in the above number, and the number of deaths in this class is yearly 20,274, making, for the ten years, 202,740, which added to 478,239 makes a total of 680,979. Thus we show that the disease of inebriety alone causes a greater destruction of life in the United States, than cholera, yellow fever and small-pox combined, and yet nothing is done by the general government, state or city to stay its progress, except administering to its fevered system the damp walls of a prison and the poorly ventilated cell—chains and shackles to the body to subdue the wild ravings of a delirious mind.

We shall now speak of the *insanity* of *inebriety* and its consequences.

The acute form of this disease is more prevalent in our city than any other malady, and sometimes the most rapid in its mission of destruction. The number of cases occurring during the year, ending June 30th, 1855, was 13,307, as found in the report of the Chief of Police.

From the acute springs the chronic insanity of inebriety which marches in its course to that fearful and almost incurable stage of constitutional insanity ending in idiotic darkness, which has no ray of hope to light the soul.

Chronic insanity of inebriety is found in our insane asylums to a

great extent, and produces more than one-half of the constitutional insanity in the United States. This stage of the disease should be treated in an inebriate asylum, where the patient would be entirely separated from insanity produced from other causes. Every physician knows that the mind of an inebriate is too weak to be exposed to the fearful influence of an insane asylum. It is, indeed, adding fuel to the flame, and consequences the most gloomy in character may follow. According to the census of 1840, there were in the United States 17,434 insane and idiotic persons. In reviewing the census of 1850, we find the number has increased to 31,397, making an increase for ten years of more than 80 per cent. At this ratio of increase, the United States will have, in 1950, eleven millions, two hundred and three thousand, six hundred and thirty-two insane and idiotic persons; and if our population should double every thirty years, we shall have, in the United States, in 1950, a population of two hundred and forty-three millions, eight hundred and thirty-nine thousand, two hundred and eighty-five making the ratio of insane and idiotic persons for 1950 to be one in twenty-one.

When such fearful results of the mental annihilation of a people are presented to the mind as the statistics show, the inquiry is at once made, what are the causes which are working the certain destruction of our race and country?

By our investigations we have been able to show that the prolific mother of insanity and idiocy is inebriety. To demonstrate this fact still further, we have only to state that in France, where the chronic form of inebriety is seldom seen or known, the number of insane is small, being only one to a thousand; while in Scotland, the land where inebriety is most prevalent, the ratio is one to five hundred and sixty-three; in the United States the ratio is one to seven hundred and fifty-one; in England it is one to seven hundred and ninety-three.

In my visits to the principal insane asylums of Europe and the United States, I have always found, by inquiring of the attending physician, that fifty-five per cent, of all the patients within their asylums were caused by acute, chronic or constitutional inebriety.

The destruction of the physical and mental powers of the people of the United States by this disease alone is so vast in its character and rapid in its increase, that it requires no voice of inspiration to pen the

certain downfall of our republic and the complete annihilation of our people. The simple rule of multiplication proves with mathematical certainty that before a thousand years have rolled away into the deep gulf of the past, this nation will be sepulchred in earth's great cemetery, and the historian will have written its gloomy epitaph by the side of her sister republics, Greece and Rome.

The success which has followed the treatment of this disease by the practitioners of the past and present centuries has been small indeed, owing to the want of proper remedies which the physician has not had at his disposal, and the nature of the diseased state of the mind, which he has mistaken for the peculiar malady of the body. Our treatment I will here describe in connection with that adopted at the present day. An asylum instead of jails and prisons, a home administering to his physical comforts and medical wants, moral instructions and religious teachings, a retreat looking out into the happy future of restored manhood, we offer as a *substitute* for iron bars and grates, where the air vibrates with the oaths of the degraded thief and cruel murderer, or the wild screech of the maniac which opens to his vision a night of darkness which knows no morrow;—we offer the physician who regard's him as an equal and treats him as a companion, instead of the harsh and unfeeling treatment too often received from the keepers of our prisons and penitentiaries, who consider him in the light of a felon; the gentle and holy influence of the minister of Christ, pointing out the path to Heaven through the atonement of the Son of God, in place of the blighting, degrading, and forever damning seeds of vice sown by the ministers of the devil found in our prisons as the associates of the inebriate.

In the treatment of this disease I have always used tonics instead of stimulants (as adopted by the old mode of practice), having found that stimulants aggravated internal congestions, and produced a stage in this disease most dangerous in its results; a stage often followed by delirium tremens and convulsions. The tonics I have prescribed have produced a favorable action in the system. Baths have relieved internal congestions, and mild cathartics have obviated costiveness. Other remedies have been used as occasion has required. Under this treatment I have never had a case of delirium tremens. The success a ending this treatment depends upon the control which the physician

has over his patient, as well as the remedies employed. I have had much trouble in treating three-fourths of my cases, for the sole reason that before I had brought the tone of the system above par, and the mind to a corresponding state of health, my patient would have fresh attacks of the disease by being exposed to the causes of this malady. Relapse after relapse would follow, until death closed the scene. From this we prove the importance of an asylum, where the patient would be under the complete control of the physician, and where medical, physical, moral, and religious influences could be brought to bear directly upon the patient. A sufficient time must be allowed for bringing up the tone of the system, creating a healthy action of the mind, awakening the moral sensibilities and revealing to the soul the true image of God.

To further illustrate the want of an asylum for the successful treatment of this disease, I will mention a case where I exhausted every effort. I went so far as to take the patient into my own office, and invited him to my own house, and shared with him my own bed. It was a case which brought me home to my early years and schoolboy hours. It was one who had been my classmate, whose head and heart I well knew. He had natural abilities very seldom met with or excelled. He was a graduate of the Jefferson School in Philadelphia, in the year 1842, and left this institution with the highest honors to himself and pride to his friends. He excelled every student in his class in the branch of chemistry, and corrected several mistakes made by the Professor of that science. He was a great favorite of the late Prof. Grenville Sharpe Patterson, then of that school. Prof. P. remarked to a friend that "Dr. H. would one day make his mark in the scientific world. He considered him a genius, and should watch him with interest as he labored up the rugged path to professional greatness." Dr. H. soon after graduating left for Europe to enlarge his medical observations. He arrived in London in May, 1842, and soon after left for Paris. He had letters of introduction to Velpeau of that city, Wilson and Wilkinson of London, Liebig of Germany, and many other distinguished men in Europe. After attending lectures in Paris a year he became fully acquainted with the scientific men of that city, and being an excellent French scholar he soon became a favorite with the students. With a pack on his shoulder he

made the tour of France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland. By his persevering industry and powers of memory, he acquired the Italian language in his journey from France to Italy. His knowledge of the German and Danish languages was good. His natural abilities for acquiring languages may be illustrated by the fact of his learning the Spanish grammar in twenty-four hours. He was a student of Liebig, and a favorite with that great man.

After remaining in Europe four years and visiting the principal colleges of medicine on the Continent, he returned to his native country richly stored with that scientific knowledge which his highly cultivated mind had enabled him to acquire. On his arrival home his friends were looking for a Professorship for him in some institution, which by his abilities he would have filled with honor to himself. Two years after his return to America he began to drink, and lost his interest in everything. His respect for himself was soon lost in the passion for alcoholic drinks. His body became diseased, his mind and firmness of character a wreck. He was a wandering, homeless, and friendless inebriate. In his sober moments he called at my office, ragged, filthy, and sick. He told me his condition, and requested that I should take him under my protection until he could recover physically; his mind would then be sufficiently strong to withstand the causes of this disease. I took him, as I said before, to my office, to my table, and bed. I administered to him medically, I attended to his physical wants, and reasoned with him as an *accountable* being. After four week's treatment he thought he must go East to his friends. I advised him to the contrary, as he had not sufficiently recovered. My reasonings were in vain, his determination could not be altered; so that he left with a partial recovery—in that state of body and mind which is the most disposed to fresh attacks of this malady. I learned from a friend that soon after Dr. H. returned home he began to drink, which he continued to do until the fifteenth day of March last, when he was found dead in his bed. Thus terminated an existence by this malady which had promised so much in professional excellence and individual usefulness; a life which could have been saved by this institution and made to adorn humanity.

The profession have long felt the importance of having the control of the patient, and for the want of this power have turned from the

unsuccessful treatment of the disease disheartened and discouraged. Imagine if you please the complete defeat of medication that would follow in such a disease as the yellow fever, were the patient exposed to all the changes of the atmosphere, to heat and cold, wet and dry, the burning sun of mid-day and the damp dews of midnight. I repeat it, of what avail would be the efforts of the physician were his patient thus exposed? The voice of common humanity would cry aloud for a proper shelter for the sick. To that cry a response would be made, calling into existence, like magic, hospitals of every kind and character.

Inebriety is a disease which carries annually to the grave more than *fifty thousand* persons in our own country; a malady which knows no geographical line, which respects no age or condition, but sweeps with its mighty whirlwind (every *ten years*,) into one common sepulchre *half a million* of people, without even calling forth an effort to shelter its victims, who are left to die and pass away as silently and unnoticed as the falling snow-flakes mid winter's night. Yet this malady is treated as a *crime, not as a disease;* a fact in its character most *diabolical*, and which can never be reconciled to any *divine principle of Christianity*, or a true and *enlightened civilization.*

The minister of Christ, as well as the follower of Æsculapius, has long felt the need of an asylum where inebriety could be treated medically, physically, morally, and religiously. He knows full well by sad experience that the Church has not been able to reach this physical and moral disease, which requires the love of Christ as a medicine for the soul as well as medical treatment for the body. He has thus been compelled in his duties of the ministry to turn away the *heart-broken mother*, the downcast father, the anguish-stricken sister, without providing a remedy for their unfortunate friends.

I shall now speak of the great results which will follow from the asylum which we by our humble efforts are endeavoring to establish. I would state that the experience I have had for years past in the treatment of this disease where the patient has been under my control, demonstrates that eighty per cent. can be cured by an asylum. In a conversation with Velpeau, of Paris, upon this subject, he remarked that where an asylum could be established combining *medical, physical, moral*, and *religious* treatment of inebriates, there could be at

least *eighty per cent.* cured. Wilson and Wilkinson of London, and McGregor of Scotland, have expressed like opinions to me. The venerable Dr. Nott, of Union College, in a letter to me dated January 27th, 1854, says, "It is impossible to estimate the amount of good such an institution would accomplish." The late Hon. Abbott Lawrence, in a conversation with me while he was Minister Plenipotentiary at the Court of St. James, said that "our country was greatly in want of an asylum for inebriates; and that such an institution would be another national monument to the charities of our land, which should be placed in the front rank of the benevolent enterprises of the day." With these medical facts before us, and the opinions of the great men of Europe and this country, we look forward to the certain success of this asylum. The people of our land call loudly for it, as shown by the fact that during the past two years I have received from different parts of the United States fifteen hundred and ninety letters, asking when this institution would be ready to receive patients, as they had friends whom they wished to have enter said asylum. One of these letters, which was written to the Hon. ex-Governor Hunt, and forwarded to me, I will present:

*Philadelphia, Sept.* 24, 1854.

Ex-Governor Hunt—

*Dear Sir:* I take the liberty of addressing you on a subject that deeply interests me. Having seen your name connected with a benevolent institution, and heading a list of Directors of the highest respectability, I have chosen you, sir, as the only one whose name is familiar to me, for the information I need in regard to the institution of the United States Inebriate Asylum. I am the mother of an unfortunate son, whose present situation demands of me prompt and immediate action. He is the son of the late Dr. T., and is in Ohio with my son-in-law. Has been engineering with him since last winter. Has done well until the weather became very hot. Was sick and weak all summer. Mr. H. informed me that he drank very hard, has had several fits, and is unable to work, and has lost all power over himself to abstain from drinking. This is too dreadful for me to bear without making an effort to save him. He is twenty-two years of age, and has occasionally indulged in drinking before, although the habit has never before been fixed. I appeal to your kindness as a

widowed mother. Is there any hope? Is there any refuge for my son? I beg you will write me, and advise with me, and inform me what to do to avail myself of the benefit of this institution, which seems to me to be the only way wherein I can find any help, and you will receive the hearty thanks and kind feelings of an afflicted mother. I drink this bitter cup alone, save God "who tempers the wind to the shorn lamb." Most respectfully yours, H. T.

Such is the appeal of the mothers of America, whose shipwrecked sons amount to the enormous number of more than two hundred and fifty thousand, and who are now crossing an ocean boundless, shoreless, and tempestuous, without a single beacon to light and direct them to the harbor of safety, without a dry-dock to repair their weak and diseased bodies, which bear on life's voyage the priceless cargo of an immortal soul.

The want of such an asylum brings to me daily some poor, bloated, sick creature, knocking at the door of this institution for admittance. The whole number of inebriates who have applied (in person at my office) to enter the asylum, is seven hundred and twenty-one, which are classified thus:

| | |
|---|---|
| Liberally educated | 157 |
| Mechanics | 465 |
| Laborers | 105 |
| Total | 727 |

One of the applicant's history I will give in a few words. About a year since a man called on me, who by his conversation and general appearance had evidently seen better days. He told me that he was a graduate of an Eastern college, and had been teaching school, in Maine, but by dissipation had lost his situation as a teacher, and was now homeless and penniless. He said he came to enquire if the asylum for inebriates was open, and to see if he could enter it. He told me that he knew his own weakness, and that in his present physical condition it was impossible for him to recover, and his only alternative was to go on the island among thieves or perish in the streets. For the further history of this man I am indebted to Dr. C., an Episcopal clergyman, of Brooklyn, which I will state in substance. "About dusk one Saturday evening," said Dr. C., "a man called at my house and enquired for me. The servant told him I was engaged. He then said that he wished to see me on particular business. I went to the

door, when the stranger said he wished to have a talk with me. I asked him in, when he first enquired if I was not from Vermont and if I did not graduate from such a college, and if I knew such a family, and such a young man, who was a class-mate of mine. All of these questions I answered in the affirmative. He then asked me when I had seen this class-mate of mine and what he was doing? I told him that the person he referred to was in New York about five years since engaged in writing for several periodicals, and bid fair to gain for himself a reputation in the literary world, as he was a fine scholar and would shine in any position. The man then asked me if I knew him. I told him I did not. Said he, please light another burner and see if you can recognise a familiar feature. I did as he requested, but could not find a line upon his countenance to remind me that I had ever seen his face before. Said he, 'I am the person whom you have been describing—one who has been your associate and classmate; one who at this moment stands robbed of every feature which was once engraven upon every class-mate's heart.' I replied, sir, you are imposing upon me—you are no such man. He replied, 'Do you not remember the time we walked to such a place; and have you forgotten the conversation that took place in regard to such a person?' I required no further proof. It was indeed my old acquaintance standing before me, a wreck of humanity, in whose haggard countenance I was unable to discover a single feature of a once bosom friend." Such is the appeal and history of one who in early years bid fair to out-strip all his associates. Such is the biography of thousands who are perishing in a more friendless ocean than the Polar sea. The impulses which prompted the men of our country to rescue the Arctic navigator were noble indeed; but the combined effort of our citizens to save thousands of our people from a clime more perilous than that in which Franklin perished, would be an epoch in our history, and an honor to our common humanity.

# AN ACT

TO INCORPORATE THE UNITED STATES INEBRIATE ASYLUM, FOR THE REFORMATION OF THE POOR AND DESTITUTE INEBRIATE.—PASSED APRIL 15TH, 1854.

*The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:*

SECTION 1. All persons who shall become stockholders pursuant to this act, shall be and they are hereby constituted a body politic and corporate by the name of the United States Inebriate Asylum.

§ 2. The said asylum shall continue for the period of fifty years, with the power to sue and be sued, to make and use a common seal, and alter the same at pleasure.

§ 3. The said asylum shall have power in and by their corporate name to purchase, hold and convey real or leasehold estate in the city of New York, and to erect thereon a building or buildings suitable for the purpose of an asylum hereinbefore named, and such other buildings as may be necessary for manufacturing and mercantile purposes connected with such institution, and to purchase, hold and convey such personal property as may be necessary for the objects above specified, and for no other purpose whatever.

§ 4. The capital of said asylum shall be fifty thousand dollars, but may be increased to two hundred thousand dollars at any time the board of directors may think it compatible with the best interest of said asylum, and shall be divided into shares of ten dollars each, and shall be deemed personal property, and transferable in such manner as the said asylum shall by by-laws direct. And said asylum

shall be deemed fully organized, and may commence operations when ten per cent of its capital is paid in.

§ 5. On the first Monday of each year, fifty per cent. of the income of said institution shall be appropriated for the exclusive purpose of supporting poor and destitute inebriates and their families. The remaining fifty per cent. shall be a fund to be appropriated for the payment of interest on the capital stock of said asylum which shall in no case exceed seven per cent. and other incidental expenses.

§ 6. All the affairs and concerns of said asylum shall be managed and conducted by and under the direction of twenty directors, who shall be stockholders and citizens of the State of New York, and who shall be elected by the stockholders annually on the first Monday in January in each year, by ballot, by plurality of the stockholders present and represented by proxy, each share having one vote; and if for any cause such election shall not be so held, the said asylum shall not be deemed dissolved, but such election shall be held within six months thereafter. Notice of the time and place of each election shall be published for two weeks immediately preceding the day appointed therefor, in two daily newspapers, printed and published in the city of New York.

§ 7. The board of directors, annually, from their own body, and as soon as may be after their election, shall proceed to elect by ballot a president and treasurer of the asylum, who, so long as they shall continue directors of said asylum, shall hold their offices respectively during the pleasure of the board of directors, and said directors shall have the power to fill vacancies in their own body caused by the death, resignation, the ceasing to be a shareholder, or removal from the State of New York or otherwise, of any director or directors, and to make all such by-laws not inconsistent with the laws of this State, or the United States, as they may deem proper for the management of the affairs of said asylum, and shall appoint annually by ballot, at least thirty days before such election of directors of said asylum, after the first, three fit and disinterested persons, inspectors of the then next election of directors, and at any time before the election supply any vacancy which may occur in the office of any such inspector; and ten of the board of directors shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and all committees, physicians, agents and

officers, authorised by this act or by the by-laws of this asylum, shall be appointed by the board of directors.

§ 8. No shareholder of this asylum shall be liable in his or her individual capacity for any contract, debt or engagement of said asylum after the full amount of their stock is paid in.

§ 9. The indebtedness of this asylum shall not at any time exceed an amount equal to fifty per cent. of the capital paid in; and if the indebtedness of said asylum shall at any time exceed such amount, the directors of said asylum shall be personally and individually liable for such excess to the creditors of said asylum.

§ 10. The board of directors of said asylum shall make an annnal report on the 3d Wednesday in January of each year, in detail of their proceedings, expenditures, income, and the affairs of said Asylum, verified by the affidavit of the president and treasurer, which report shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of State.

§ 11. That G. P. Parker, A. G. Phelps, E. A. Lambert, J. D. Wright, Jacob S. Miller, A. Stuart, James Brown, N. A. Prince, Jeremiah Terbell, C. C. North, Robert C. Embree, Alfred Brush, J. Edward Turner, Z. Pratt, Washington Hunt, E. B. Morgan, Noah Worrall, Henry Dubois, Robert L. Stevens, and G. B. Alvord, shall constitute the first board of directors, who shall hold their offices until the first Monday of January, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five, when the regular election shall take place, and they shall be commissioners whose duty it shall be, within five months after the passage of this act, at some suitable place or places in the city of New York, and such other places as they may determine, to open books, to receive subscriptions to the capital stock of said asylum, for the period of sixty days, or until the said capital stock shall be subscribed for.

§ 12. This act shall continue in force for the period of fifty years, subject, however, to amendments, modifications, and repeal by the legislature, and at the dissolution of said institution, the asylum and the grounds attached thereto shall be ceded to the State of New York, to be used by said State for some benevolent institution.

§ 13. Nothing herein contained shall be construed or held as intending to confer any banking or insurance privileges.

§ 14. This act shall take effect immediately.

STATE OF NEW YORK, *Secretary's Office.*

I have compared the preceding with the original law on file in this office, and hereby certify the same to be a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of said original.

Given under my hand and seal of office, at the city of Albany, this eighteenth day of April, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four.

A. G. JOHNSON, *Dep. Secretary of State.*

---

## AN ACT

TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED STATES INEBRIATE ASYLUM.—PASSED APRIL 23D, 1855.

*The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:*

SECTION I. The Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the United States Inebriate Asylum," Passed April 15th, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four, is hereby amended so as to read as follows.

§ 2. This Institution shall have power in and by its corporate name, to lease a building or buildings suitable for said Asylum, and such other buildings as the Institution may require, and to hold such personal property as may be required to carry on said Institution.

§ 3. The said Institution shall have power to retain all inebriates who enter said Asylum for the period of three months, or six months, if the patient's reformation should require it.

§ 4. The first Board of Directors shall hold their offices until the first Monday in January, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six, when a new Board shall be chosen, and five of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

§ 5. This Act shall take effect immediately.

STATE OF NEW YORK, *Secretary's Office.*

I have compared the preceding with the original law on file in this

office, and do hereby certify that the same is a correct transcript therefrom, and of the whole of said original law.

Given under my hand and seal of office, at the city of Albany, this eleventh day of May, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five.

A. G. JOHNSON, *Dep. Secretary of State.*

---

## ASYLUM FOR INEBRIATES.

### REPORT OF THE DIRECTORS AND APPEAL TO THE PUBLIC.

We, the undersigned, appointed by the Legislature of the State of New York, to organize an Institution to be known as "The United States Inebriate Asylum, and to act as Commissioners to receive subscriptions to the capital stock of said Asylum," do herewith submit to the public the following statement:

The object of this Institution is to provide an asylum for the poor and destitute inebriate, where his physical and moral condition will be alike the care of the physician and the philanthropist, and where his labor may be rendered productive and of service to his family. With the asylum there will be connected work shops, in which each patient as soon as his coudition will permit, will be regularly employed—thus making the Asylum a self supporting institution. It will be seen that the community will thus be relieved of the burden of maintaining inebriates in almshouses and prisons; who will be separated from the society of those incarcerated for public crimes, and placed where their inebriety will be treated as a *disease*, and where no efforts will be wanting to produce in them a thorough reformation; and where an income from their labor will be secured to their families, who otherwise would be left to penury and suffering. To carry out successfully the great aim of the Institution, $50,000 must be raised; this being the amount of Capital Stock required by the Charter. This amount, which can be increased when necessary, is divided into shares of $10 each. Any person wishing to subscribe to the Capital

Stock, can send his name with the amount he will take to any one of the Directors.

We think it judicious to lease a building or buildings, (until suitable edifices can be erected) for the purpose of entering at once, or as soon as practicable, upon the work for which the charter was granted. In accordance with a provision in the act of incorporation, there will be a Report on the third Wednesday of January in each year, of the proceedings, expenditures, income, and condition of the Asylum, verified by the affidavits of the President and Treasurer, which Report must be filed in the office of the Secretary of State.

In regard to the necessity of an institution of this character, we cite no less authority than Dr. Benjamin Rush :

"To the account of physical remedies," he says, "I add one more, viz.: The establishment of a hospital in every city and town in the United States, for the exclusive purpose of hard drinkers. They are as much the objects of public humanity and charity as mad people. They are indeed more hurtful to society than most of the deranged patients of a common hospital would be, if they were set at liberty.

We are happy in giving assurance that this enterprise meets with the approbation and encouragement of many of the most intelligent and philanthropic members of the community. The directors put forth this brief statement of their object and plan of operations with the expectation of meeting a quick and cordial response from the benevolent of this and other sections of the country. The call for sympathy and material aid in laying a permanent bases of an Institution that promises much for the recovery and salvation of a large number of the human brotherhood, we are confident will meet with a ready response.

This Institution is not designed to conflict with any other method for recovering the inebriate. There is no Asylum similar to it in this or in any other country; thousands will look to it for help, and help they should and must have. That which was worth creating is worth preserving. The benevolent Father puts it in our power to save those who are ready to perish. To rescue a fellow-being from physical and spiritual thraldom, is worthy of the exercise of the highest talent and of the purest love. To redeem from ruin is greater than to create. To turn one from vice to purity, from darkness to light, from death to life, to make him the possessor of a free, enlarged, and beautified exist-

ence, is a divine mission. Everywhere goes up the wail of wrecked humanity, of prostrate and suffering brothers. From every side comes the cry for help. They are the true workers who respond to this cry. They are enriched in giving and blessed in blessing.

Fellow-Citizens, Fathers, Brothers and Sisters! Give us your aid in this branch of beneficence, and the blessing of multitudes will be your reward.

| | |
|---|---|
| Hon. Washington Hunt, *Lockport*, | G. P. Parker, |
| Hon. E. A. Lambert, | Alfred Brush, |
| Anson G. Phelps, | Henry Dubois, |
| J. D. Wright, | Noah Worral, |
| Jacob S. Miller, M. D., | G. B. Alvord, |
| Newell A. Prince, | Hon. E. B. Morgan, |
| Jeremiah Terbell, | Hon. Zadok Pratt, Prattsville, |
| C. C. North, | J. Edward Turner, M. D. |

---

## ASYLUM FOR THE POOR AND DESTITUTE INEBRIATE.

*To Hon. Fernando Wood, Mayor of the City of New York:*

Dear Sir—We are about to establish in the City of New York, an Asylum for the poor and destitute inebriate. This institution has been chartered by the Legislature of our State, giving it power by the amendment of its charter, passed April 10th, 1855, to retain all patients who are received in the Asylum for the period of three and six months, if the patient's reformation should require it. We, the projectors of this Asylum, have long felt the importance of having an institution like the one we are now, by our humble efforts, endeavoring to establish in our city. The treatment of the poor and unfortunate inebriate, in sending him to our city prisons, and there permitting him to mingle with criminals of the vilest cast, has long been a blight upon our social and moral relations as enlightened beings, which is not consistent with the great principles of Christian brotherhood. It becomes us, therefore, as Christians, and well wishers for the moral improvements of the people of our City and State, to provide a retreat and a home for this unfortunate and neglected class of our citizens.

We wish to treat inebriety as a disease, and not as a crime. We wish, by medical and physical comforts, to recruit the exhausted powers of the constitution, strengthen the springs of life, and give them fresh energy and vigor; by kindness and love we wish to prove to the

world that there is no one who has given way to the disease of intemperance, but can be reclaimed to their families, their country and their God.

Knowing the deep and lively interest yon take in all the great benevolent institutions of our country, and the vital importance you attach to the cultivation of sound morals for the people of our land, as the only substantial basis on which our institutions can exist and flourish, convinces us that we shall have your entire support in founding this Asylum in our city, which will be the only one of the kind in this country or in Europe. We would be pleased to have your views upon the moral importance of having in our city an Asylum for the unfortunate inebriate, as a substitute for sending him to our city prisons, where he will mingle with the criminal and become schooled in vice. With much respect, I remain your humble and obedient servant,

J. EDWARD TURNER, M. D.,

303 East Broadway, New York.

## MAYOR WOOD'S REPLY.

*Mayor's Office, New York, May* 12, 1855.

Dear Sir :—Your favor of the 10th inst., is received. I approve of the proposed Asylum for the Poor and Destitute Inebriate. Its objects are purely philanthropic, and should commend themselves to the good and humane of all classes. Such an institution has long been wanted in this city.

The reasons why it is impolitic, as well as cruel, to incarcerate the inebriate within the same prison walls as the convict, are so obvious, that no argument or statement is necessary to enforce them. My many other engagements do not leave me time to go more at length into this subject now, but you may rest assured that I fully appreciate the objects of this enterprise, and it has my best wishes for success.

Very respectfully yours,

FERNANDO WOOD, *Mayor.*

To J. Edward Turner, M. D., 303 East Broadway, New York.

Any person or persons wishing to subscribe to the fund of the United States Inebriate Asylum, can subscribe their names, with the amount, to the form below, and forward the same to either of the committee on subscription.

ANSON G. PHELPS, Esq., 21 Cliff Street,
Rev. N. A. PRINCE, 271 Broadway,
J EDWARD TURNER, M. D., 303 East Broadway.

We, the undersigned, do hereby agree to pay the United States Inebriate Asylum, (as a fund to found said institution,) all sums of money which we annex to our respective signatures, when fifty thousand dollars are subscribed.

| NAME. | RESIDENCE. | AMOUNT SUBSCRIBED. |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

# MISSION SCHOOLS.

## Shall they be Abolished or Sustained?

(From the Presbyterian Quarterly Review for Dec. 1855.)

### THE FOREIGN MISSION QUESTION.

The Church of Christ, in accordance with the last command of her all-glorious, and all-powerful Head, has undertaken the work of converting all nations to the obedience of the faith. Relying upon the promised aid of the Holy Spirit, she has addressed herself to this task, nor does she falter in her hopes of its full achievement. Great as the undertaking confessedly is, final and entire success is the only issue which she anticipates.

It may however be questioned, whether the hopes based upon the word of God, are not, in part at least, sustained by ignorance of the actual vastness of the undertaking, and of the hinderances to its accomplishment. The conversion of whole nations, with millions and tens of millions of subjects, the displacement of idolatry, infidelity, and hatred of the Gospel, the planting of the Church with its ordinances and ministry upon a soil so lately hostile, the provision for a perpetuation of these institutions of religion, is a work whose greatness is rather conceded than understood, rather admit-

ted than grasped or comprehended. We look upon it, therefore, as a matter of congratulation, that the Churches with which we are associated in this work have, in the Providence of God, been called at the present time, to scan more closely the means relied upon for success by their representatives in the foreign field. As lovers of the cause, we rejoice that it is attracting the earnest scrutiny of those most competent to deepen and widen, and speed onward anew, the efforts of the people of God for the conversion of the heathen nations to Christ.

This work in which we are engaged is no temporary one. It is a life-long labor which God has laid upon us. A spasmodic effort, a brilliant charge, the springing of a mine, will not give the Church possession of lands now occupied by idolatry and superstition. We must count upon hinderances, delays, difficulties, and obstinate resistance. Counting the cost, we must put on the harness, and, imitating the unconquerable obstinacy of mere earthly warriors, resolve to dig, and sap, and mine, and ever to advance, assured that when we fall, in trench, or breach, or camp, or assault, others will come forward to fill our places, and hold the ground we gain. It need occasion no surprise, that in an effort so vast, so complicated and so long protracted, there should be a call from time to time to examine our position and our modes of procedure. We should expect that the teachings of experience, as well as the results of thoughtful attention, would afford data for the correction of errors, or suggest improvement in our use of means. God has in his wisdom left us in many things to the exercise of judgment, and it becomes us to learn from the history of the past, lessons of wisdom for the future. Hence, as we have said, we rejoice that attention has been called to the THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MISSIONS, and would contribute our mite towards the elucidation of a subject in which, as a Church, we have so deep an interest and so large a stake.

On the most cursory glance at the history of modern missions, we notice a peculiarity by which they are distinguish-

ed from the missions of apostolic times; we refer to the establishment of schools as an aid, both direct and indirect, in the work of evangelization. The apostles went from city to city, tarrying according to circumstances and the divine mandate, days, weeks, months, or years, preaching, strengthening, and ordaining; but so far as we can learn from the inspired page, not establishing schools for the young. On the other hand, the missionaries of modern times, men often of an undoubted apostolic spirit and life, have with remarkable unanimity, in connection with the preaching of the word, established schools for the Christian education of youth. To glance at those Missions with which we are most familiar, we find, for instance, that when, in 1734, Mr. John Sergeant resigned his office as tutor in Yale College to commence a mission among the Mohegans, he "placed his chief hope of success in the education of youth." The heavenly minded David Brainerd, whilst preaching to the Indians in Massachusetts, also superintended an English school taught by his interpreter. On his removal to New Jersey in 1746, he there also formed a school, a few months after his arrival. If we turn our eyes from the early Missions in America to the beginnings of labor among the *Hindus*, we find that Ziegenbalg and Plutsche, men whose zeal and devotion have rarely been exceeded, on their arrival at Tranquebar in Southern India, being deeply convinced of the importance of early instruction, lost no time in establishing a school for the education of such native Tamil children as they could collect for this purpose, some of whom they contrived to feed and clothe at their own expense. When, in 1728, a mission was commenced at Madras by Schultz, schools were a part of its machinery; and the apostolic Schwartz, soon after landing and reaching his field in Southern India, writes, "I began a catechetical hour in the Tamil school with the youngest lambs and thus I learned to stammer with them." Turn to another continent, and there also the missionary Schmidt, sent by the Moravians of Germany in 1736, to make known Christ to the despised sons of Africa, soon founded the first Hottentot

school. Passing to the date of the commencement of the first mission of the American Board, that at Bombay, we find, that in 1815, the brethren made such efforts as their means allowed for the education of heathen children. In the first year of the Jaffna Mission, (1816) boys were brought under the instruction of the missionaries and their assistants, and soon after a few little girls were gathered, forming the germ of the Oodooville boarding-school. In the same year the mission among the Cherokees was commenced, and the erection of a "comfortable school-house," was one of their earliest movements. In 1820, a mission was begun in the Sandwich Islands, and before the close of the year four schools were established. This list might be indefinitely prolonged, with similar statements concerning missions in Asia, Africa, America, and the Islands of the Pacific; but enough has been adduced to show a remarkable agreement among men of different generations, from various lands, and upon widely separated fields, in the use of the school in conjunction with the preaching of the truth to adults, as an agency for promoting the work of evangelization. In the wilds of our own frontiers, among the Hottentots and Zulus of South Africa, in the mountains of Kurdistan, on the torrid plains of India, in the sea-ports of China and the retired islets of Polynesia; nay, wherever, almost without exception, the banner of the cross has been raised, there do we find children and youth gathered for instruction in the mission school.

The fact is a remarkable one. What does it mean? It would seem to be a missionary instinct. To say that this course is not in accordance with piety, zeal and wisdom, that it is not the fruit of apostolic devotedness, conflicts harshly with the universality of its adoption by men whose lives are regarded as the highest exemplifications of Christian character, under circumstances so varied, and on fields so independent, in all things one of another. Yet, that it is a departure from the strict line of apostolic precedent, is undeniable.

If now we turn to the results of the efforts of the Churches of the foreign field, during the past forty years, that we may

in some sense test our modes by our progress, our theories by their fruit, a two-fold answer will be returned, according to the standard by which they are measured. Viewed positively, these results are glorious and cheering. Whole tribes have been rescued from barbarism and raised to the rank of Christian men; islands sunk in the depths of licentiousness, idolatry, and even cannibalism, have taken their place among civilized nations; the most degraded races of South Africa have yielded brightest gems for our Saviour's crown; nominal Christians have returned to the standard of truth and abjured their false doctrines; and even India and China, the strongholds of heathenism in the East, have been the scenes of outpourings of the Divine Spirit, and the birth place of souls. Christian churches, even though at long intervals, stud the world, twinkling like the stars of heaven in every quarter of its sin-darkened hemispheres.

Viewed, however, not in their own worth, nor according to what we had reason to anticipate with a full understanding of the obstacles to be overcome, but in comparison with the expectations of the sanguine, the results are less satisfactory. It was the confident anticipation of many good men, at the time of the inauguration of our present operations, that a few years of missionary labor would overspread large portions of the heathen world with Christianity. Idolaters were spoken of as stretching forth their hands for the Gospel; true enough as a figurative representation of their need, but quite false as a statement of their desires. The victims of false religion were represented as slaves to sin, waiting for the proclamation of liberty through Christ; true enough as to their actual bondage to Satan, but false as to their willingness to accept the heaven-sent boon. With the sanguine, these figurative statements passed for realities, and brilliant success was looked for at an early day. To such views and expectations, the results of missionary labor seem most inadequate and disheartening. After laboring for forty years, they find heathenism and false religion still occupying the greater part of the habitable globe. But it is forgotten that apostolic gifts and

labors, followed up by the zeal of the evangelists of the primitive Church, besieged the Roman empire for three centuries before the Cross supplanted the Eagle upon her strongholds and banners. Undervaluing the work to be accomplished and the difficulties to be encountered, they are ready to conclude, because every thing is not done, that nothing is done, and to cry out—"missions a failure." Others there are, and among them many missionaries, who, though not thus cast down by the disappointment of hopes unwarranted by the history of the Church, still feel that all has not been done that might have been done. With souls yearning over dying myriads, and longing for the more rapid spread of the only remedy for sin, they are ready to exclaim, "Why tarry His chariot wheels so long! Oh! where is the promise of His coming!" Admitting that God has greatly blessed the labors of his unworthy servants, and that in some fields the harvest has been great even to astonishment, the same cannot be asserted of all missionary fields. In many a spot where sin abounds, although the labors of many years have been there expended, the missionary, looking about him, exclaims, "Who hath believed our report! to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" Ready to convict himself of error, with a jealous eye the laborer scans his heart, his theory and his practice, and asks, "Where is the fault? What better can we do?" The new comer with warm desires and great expectations, unable to appreciate the advance that has actually been made by his predecessors, is ready to imagine that previous modes are at fault, and suggests new measures. Anxious directors and friends of missions at home, impatient of the slow advances made, begin to inquire whether there be not something wrong, and seek to show the remedy. Thus, between old missionaries and new, laborers at home and abroad, and the host of lookers on, it is not surprising that we should have more than one scheme laid down as the proper method of missions.

Whilst the main current of Christian missions, from all lands to all lands, has ever set steadily in favor of a combina-

tion of preaching, teaching and scattering the word of God, as the true plan for evangelization in heathen countries, two widely different courses have been struck out for the more perfect and speedy attainment of the end proposed, by the divergence in two opposite directions of some of the friends of missions. These diverging theories may be characterised as the educational system, and the system of exclusive oral preaching. The one would correct the ordinarily accepted theory of missions, by giving greater prominence to the Christian education of youth; the other by relying mainly, if not entirely, upon the oral proclamation of the Gospel to adults. We shall attempt fairly, and as fully as our space will allow, to present the respective positions of the two parties, turning our attention more particularly to India, perhaps the most difficult of mission fields, as well as the most familiar, and one to which the notice of the public is at present particularly called.

The *educational system* has been adopted by the Presbyterians both of the Kirk and the Free Church of Scotland, in their India missions. It was introduced at Calcutta by Dr. Duff, the deservedly eminent and admired senior of these missions. It is now the system pursued by the Scotch missionaries at Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Nagpore and elsewhere. As it has been much misunderstood, and the principles upon which it is advocated often decried, it is but an act of justice to state the views of these unquestionably earnest and godly men, as held by themselves, whilst to inquirers on the "Theory of Missions" it will be suggestive, and as we may hope, interesting. Those desiring to study the subject more thoroughly, will find in "Duff on India and India Missions," (pages 284—423,) the arguments from which we make the following brief:

The principle lying at the foundation of Hinduism, as a religious system, is exclusive self-reliance—self-righteousness. The remedy for this false doctrine is the unfolding of righteousness in Christ—the Gospel. The question that meets us in our work is, How can we most effectually communicate a

saving knowledge of Christ? How can we bring to pass the intellectual, moral and spiritual regeneration of the universal mind of India, and that in the speediest and most thorough manner? By common consent there are three generic modes of applying the Gospel to the people, viz:

1. Preaching the Gospel to adults.
2. Teaching it to the young.
3. The translation and circulation of the Scriptures and religious works.

All these modes,—Dr. Duff argues,—have been blessed, and should be used. They are not antagonists but allies; and to pitch them against each other is folly and wrong. Christian education and preaching differ in the subjects and in the modes of application of the truth conveyed, but not in essence. We should not therefore be influenced by names so as to imagine them to be essentially different or antagonistic. "Go teach all nations," is parallel to "Go preach to every creature." By *teaching*, in its present connection, he understands communicating the Gospel to the young; by *preaching*, communicating it to those of riper years. Circumstances may decide which of the different modes shall take precedence of the others. Thus the savage, without an alphabet, whose language has not been reduced to writing, must be preached to before he is offered a Bible, or taught to read. The Chinese may be reached by books or tracts before they can be approached by the preacher or teacher. In India again, both modes may be used, and the question will be on the relative prominence to be given to each part of the work.

The Scotch Presbyterian Church have chosen and stedfastly adhered to what they denominate *the Christian education scheme.* In former educational evangelistic efforts, Dr. D. thinks too much was expected from schools of a low grade, and too little attention paid to a thorough, long-continued course of training. Elementary schools for a large number can only be wisely used,—in present circumstances,—as a preparation for higher educational institutions. Upon these last we must rely for the true results of Christian education as a missionary effort.

The Gospel must be preached to the adult population. The question of questions is, Who are to be preachers? The churches at home have been hitherto looked to for those who shall carry the word of life through heathen nations. But, viewing the immense number of preachers needed, the difficulty of obtaining the men, their expensiveness, their reduction by illness and death, their want of acquaintance with the languages and customs of the people, &c., he argues, that we must look to the churches of Christendom for the original supply of laborers to communicate the first impulse, and then let these give that shape and direction to their operations which may most speedily cause the field itself to send forth the continuous supply.

The Gospel can only be said to flourish when it can live and perpetuate itself independent of foreign aid. Up to this point it is not truly a thing of the soil, but an exotic. A few real propagators of Christianity are worth more than thousands of converts unable to diffuse sound views of Christian truth, or to hand them down to succeeding generations without the aid of foreign teachers. As regards the interests of a realm, one Knox is worth a thousand peasants, though his soul be no more precious than one of theirs. Hence the rearing of native preachers, well qualified to stand alone and diffuse the truth, should be, not a secondary or subordinate, but a primary department of missionary labor in India. This view is strengthened by the extreme difficulty with which even the present number of European laborers is maintained, and the extreme disproportion between the force engaged and the land to be possessed. If *Itinerancy* be offered as a remedy, enabling one man to pass over a large surface of territory, proclaiming the Gospel, the question arises, 'What propect of ultimate success is held out by this plan?' And the answer returned is, that without the repetition of the same means in the same locality, we can expect only a scattered and unsubstantial harvest from this mode of sowing the soil.

"In scattering handfuls of corn over the frozen crust and towering eminences of the Himalaya, a single grain might

obtain a lodgment it the crevice of a naked rock; and then, exposed to the concentrated rays of a summer sun, it might rear its nodding form far aloft, amid a region of sublime sterility; but what prospect would that hold out of reaping the bountiful returns of an autumnal increase?" Even for a circuit itinerancy, however, we cannot command a sufficiency of foreign laborers. The climate forbids this mode of labor in many districts during a great part of the year; the advantage gained is lost for want of being steadily followed up; the breached fort is repaired before the assault is renewed; a vocabulary depraved by heathen associations nullifies much that is said by the preachers. These evils can only be remedied by patient reiteration, explanation, and illustration. On these and other accounts, preaching must be not erratic but localized; but, if localized, it must be largely multiplied to meet the emergency. Hence, we must have native preachers to itinerate widely, wisely, and well. They can live at a far less expense than the European, labor more widely, reach the people more fully, and command the language more perfectly. "The real reformers of Hindustan must be Hindus." Beside sending men directly to preach the Gospel our societies must send others to devote time, talents, and energies to raising up a native ministry; and this can be best done by a long, thorough, persevering prosecution of the educational system, with the use of the English language. It will not, we think, be an unfair statement of this theory of missions to say that its chief tenet is, that the foreign missionary should rather devote himself to the raising up and training of native evangelists, than aim himself to be the evangelist.

Whilst one portion of the missionary force has thus inclined to a divergence from the main body towards a more exclusive use of educational agencies, another portion of the force, with a kindred zeal for the speediest possible conquest of the world by the Church, has, as we intimated, diverged in a different direction. It maintains that the foreign missionary should be, in the fullest sense, an evangelist,—putting his trust in the oral publication of the Gospel to adults, and repudiat-

ing schools as a means of evangelization. This theory has been more or less fully adopted by the controlling authorities of the Baptist Missionary Union, with the warm concurrence of President Wayland; by the Arcot Mission of the American Board, and by individual missionaries.

The annual meeting of the Baptist Missionary Union, held in Philadelphia in May, 1854, was rendered memorable by a highly exciting and very full discussion of the Report of the Deputation commissioned to visit the missions of the Union in the East Indies. This Deputation, consisting of the Rev. Solomon Peck, D. D., Foreign Secretary, and the Rev. James N. Grainger, met the missionaries of the Union laboring in Burmah, in convention; and, after a six week's discussion, decided, with the concurrence of the majority of the missionaries present, upon certain changes in the mode of conducting the missions of the Union in the East. The grand principle laid down and followed in these changes was, that "*oral preaching is the Divinely appointed and Divinely honored mode of evangelization.*" To secure to the work of preaching its rightful position, it was decided that every ordained missionary should give his strength to this work, subordinating to it all other labors. With regard to schools, two principles were laid down. These were,—first, that "schools are not a wise or scripturally appointed agency for propagating Christianity among a heathen people;" second, "that, whatever be their value, it is subordinate to that of preaching the Gospel to the adult population; that they are in no respect to be regarded as a substitute for, or a mode of preaching; and that the measure of demand for them is in proportion to the success which attends the preaching of the Gospel." From these principles the deputation derived "*the rule*," that mission schools should be chiefly, if not exclusively, for the benefit of the Christian population, the converts and their children. It was farther recommended that in the schools, both primary, normal, and theological, established for training Christian teachers, and preachers, the English language be excluded.

These changes caused much feeling upon the part of some

of the missionaries, and of the supporters of the Union, and gave rise to a series of warm discussions. The principles laid down by the Deputation were however sustained and adopted by the meeting.

At the same convocation, a report, drawn up by the Rev. Dr. Wayland, late of Brown University, was recommended as "containing most important principles for the consideration and guidance of our missionaries and of the Executive Committee."

In this report Dr. Wayland argues, that the special object of Christian benevolence is to convert men to God. The means to be used is the preaching of Christ and him crucified. This is the only appointed means for producing this effect; and by preaching, he understands, the oral communication of divine truth by man to man. As to teaching, it is unnecessary as a preparatory work; it has not apostolic precedent; nor is it the lawful work of an ordained preacher under the Saviour's commission. If it be argued, that the aged are hardened, and that the young should be imbued with scriptural truth and led to Christ; he replies, that to the infinite power of the Holy Spirit, "all things are equally easy;" that we cannot expect the young, if converted, to bear the brunt of persecution; that, in fact, children are not the first converts in missions; and that teaching is an uneconomical use of men. In brief, that schools are not to be regarded as a means preparatory to preaching, nor as a scriptural instrument of evangelization. In concluding the report he says, "We can perceive no essential difference between the position of missionaries in a heathen land at the present day, and the position of the apostles and first preachers of Christianity. We learn the manner in which they labored from the Acts of the Apostles. We can see no good reason, therefore, for adopting any other method than that pursued by those instructed by the Saviour himself."

The Arcot Mission of the American Board, composed of three brothers bearing a name honored in the annals of missions, adopted, in 1853, a code of rules for the guidance and government of the Mission. From that portion of those rules relating

to "preaching and education," it will be seen, that the views of this Mission on these topics are very nearly co-incident with those of the Baptist Deputation. As this is the only Mission of the American Board, which, so far as we are aware, has taken this strong ground against the use of schools as a branch of evangelistic effort, we give this part of the "rules" without abridgment:

### Preaching and Education.

"*Whereas*, we believe that India, with its teeming population, is accessible to the preaching of the Gospel from her lowliest village to her most crowded city, and—

"That God has endowed the Hindus with intellect peculiarly capable of comprehending the truths which He has revealed, and with conscience fitted to be awakened thereby, and—

"That neither schools nor any other preparative human instrumentalities are necessary in order to bring the masses into a condition of fitness for hearing the Gospel, and—

"That the way for the triumphs of Christianity is to be prepared by its public proclamation, and—

"That the vernacular languages of India furnish media fully adapted to the clear and forcible communication of divine truth, and—

"That missionaries can easily, with moderate diligence and perseverance, acquire the vernaculars so as to become good preachers, and—

"That Christ's commission recorded by the Evangelists enjoins, as the definite plan of missionary labor, the promulgation of the Gospel among the population in their own tongues—the perseverance in the use of this means until individuals and communities are proselyted to the Christian faith—and the education of proselytes and their children, and—

"That the wisdom of this or of any other age is incapable of originating better modes of agency than that simple and mighty one instituted by Christ; therefore

"*Resolved*, 1. That the words of our Lord, 'Preach the Gospel,' are recognized as the foundation stone of this Mission.

"2. That this Mission cannot encumber itself with educational establishments intended for heathen children and youth.

"3. That this Mission cannot allow any educational institutions, except those which spring out of the necessities of such communities as may be proselyted to the Christian faith.

"4. That all such institutions be strictly limited to baptized children and children of proselytes.

"5. That the instruction given in all such institutions shall be restricted to the classical and vernacular languages of India."

It will be at once perceived that the first point to be settled in this discussion is, the truth of the promise upon which the theory of missions last given is built. If it be true that the position of the modern missionary to the heathen is so essentially identical with that of the apostles, as is assumed by the supporters of this view, then can a decision be most easily reached.

If the end to be attained now is the same as in apostolic times, and, also, if the circumstances attendant upon the attainment of this end are the same, or substantially the same, then must we pronounce any serious departure from the example of inspired men, commissioned and prepared for this work by Christ himself, to be wrong. No plea of expediency, or of more mature wisdom, could justify the modern missionary in leaving the path trodden by the apostles. Admitting that the work to be done is substantially the same, that is, the permanent planting of the Church in heathen or anti-Christian lands, we will inquire whether the circumstances of the work, now and then, are so essentially or so nearly the same, as to shut us up to the letter of apostolic precedent. If the facts render an affirmative answer, then the method of missions is a matter of interpretation—the apostolic history being our text—and theories or reasonings as to modes of pro-

cedure, are treason against the simplicity of Christian confidence in the teachings of the Holy Ghost. Let us briefly but fairly examine this point, as one of immense importance, deciding, as it does, whether we shall or shall not reason as to the best mode of conducting missions among the unevangelized.

*Are the circumstances under which modern missions are conducted so identical with those under which they were conducted in the apostolic age as to shut us up to the letter of apostolic precedent?*

The question regards two parties,—the actors, and those acted upon—the preacher and the hearers—the missionary and the field.

And first, turning to the apostolic age, let us inquire *as to the agents* for the accomplishment of the work of evangelization. Who were they, and how were they qualified and equipped for their errand?

(1.) They were men fresh from the teachings of Him who spake as never man spake; witnesses of his resistless power over things animate and inanimate; filled with the consciousness of a divine mission to a world lying in darkness and sin; burning with zeal for a crucified but risen Saviour, and animated by the fervor and freshness of enthusiasm to which a new faith, when unhesitatingly received, ever gives birth. They were, in fine, Apostles of Christ, the Lord of Glory.

(2.) The apostles, moreover, were endowed with the power of working miracles, as an illustration of their divine mission. They were thus furnished with a means of inestimable power for arresting the thoughtless, attracting about them multitudes of hearers, convincing them of the divineness of their mission, and so leading them to consider and yield to the doctrines brought with such sanctions to their notice.

(3.) They were also, by a special supernatural gift,—that of tongues, or speaking various languages without previous study,—enabled to address men freely in foreign lands, and to enforce upon them the teachings to which the miraculous powers already noticed, had given illustration.

(4) It further appears from the inspired record that the apostles had conferred upon them a supernatural discernment, by which they were guided in the choice of men to fill posts of responsibility in the infant churches which were under their preaching.

(5.) And, finally, we see that on passing from churches thus instituted, to carry to new fields the Gospel banner, the apostles left behind them men miraculously raised up, and miraculously endowed with gifts for the edification, instruction, government, and extension of the churches. These officers of the apostolic age, and their gifts, are summarily designated (1 Cor. xii. 28) as "prophets, teachers, miracles, gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."

Such, in part, was the equipment of the apostles for their work, as promulgators of the Gospel of Christ. Let us now glance at the *circumstances of the fields* to which they were sent, as far as they bear upon the present inquiry. The apostles went from Judea, mainly to the cities of Greece, Asia Minor and Macedonia; to Rome, Alexandria, and other cities of the Roman empire. The bare statement will, of itself, suggest to the reader the point to which we wish to direct attention, namely, that the apostles went from less to more civilized communities—from a land of comparatively low literary culture to the high places of learning for the then known world. Judea might shed moral, but not scientific or literary light, upon the renowned cities of Greece. The very names of Athens, Pergamos, Alexandria and Rome in the Augustan age, so synonymous with memories of ancient learning and science, preclude the necessity of enlarging upon this topic.

It should also be noted, that we learn from the inspired record of the labors of the chief evangelist of the apostolic company—what we gather also from profane history—that almost into whatever city or town the preacher of that generation entered, he there found, in the first place, a company collected in the synagogue, ready to admit everything he claimed but the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth; and also a community more or less acquainted with the mono-

theistic faith of Judea, and prepared to appreciate the arguments from the Old Testament, the sacred book of the Jews who lived beside them, to the New Testament, which the apostles maintained to be its complement and key. Finally, the apostles had not the printing press, with its facilities, for the multiplication of written volumes.

Let us glance now at the modern missionary and his field, that we may see whether his position is in all things the same as that of the apostle, or so nearly the same as to shut him up to a use of the same means so far as he can command them. Look at the man and his qualifications. The commission directly conferred by Christ, the miraculous endowments to attest his errand, the gift of tongues, supernatural discernment, the miraculous provision of successors from the native church, with which the apostles were furnished—are those his? And, on the other hand, his field. Does he go from less to more learned lands? from less to more cultivated nations? Does he find the synagogue with its open Bible, and an audience prepared by mental culture to appreciate his words and arguments? We need hardly say that the diversity, under both heads, is most striking; nor need we occupy our limited space by tracing out for the reader the lines of difference which his own acquaintance with the subject will supply. Omitting the mention of other very striking differences between the position of the Christian evangelist of that day and this, it is enough for our present purpose if we can assert, as we think that we safely may, that *the circumstances under which modern missions are conducted are not so identical with those under which they were conducted in apostolic times*, as to shut us up to the letter of apostolic precedent. Hence, to show in the modes of conducting missions at the present day a departure from apostolic precedent, is not of itself a proof of error on the part of our missionaries, or of the directors of our missionary boards. Error there may be, and doubtless often is, but it is not proved by the fact that means are used not found in apostolic precedents.

It is a noteworthy fact, that the advocates of a strict adhe-

rence to apostolic example should limit their scruples to a single point. In the matter of schools no exception can be made, no variation be allowed. The apostles established no schools; their example is our law of procedure; therefore the modern missionary may not establish schools—a syllogism from which they see no escape. Let circumstances be what they may, the indications of Providence what they will, it matters not, there is but one divinely appointed mode of evangelization, and that is not the establishment of schools. But why may we not insert "printing press" in the place of "schools?" Will not the syllogism be as true? Or if "executive committee" or "mission treasurer" be inserted, will not the argument be as sound? Nay, if we are to disregard the Providential changes which make the nineteenth century to differ from the first, should we not abjure such unapostolic machinery as boards, committees and secretaries? Should we not turn from the steamboat and rail-road, and discarding letters of credit, take our staff and scrip and set out in truly primitive style for our field of labor; and when there, renouncing the use of those modern innovations the printed Bible and tracts, should we not sit down to copy out, on apostolic "parchments," the Epistles and Gospels needed for the churches?

It will be replied, doubtless, "We do not deny the existence of circumstantial differences of position of the two parties; it is 'essential differences' whose existence we deny." If so, let it be conceded that circumstantial differences of position will call for circumstantial changes in the modes of procedure, and on this point their need be no further controversy. All agree as to the essential aim and scope of the missionary work; it is to bring the glorious truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ so to bear upon men in heathen lands that the Church may, in the speediest and best way possible, be built up over the whole earth. In doing this, let us not ignore the existence of a state of things which compels us to ask, not merely, how did the apostles labor, but how far shall existing circumstances modify our imitation of their modes of labor. The apostles used

every appliance fairly within their reach. To do the same discriminatingly, prayerfully and zealously, is truly to follow in their footsteps. They did not go from Judea to found schools in Athens; but it by no means follows that, if to-day they were to go, without miraculous endowments, from New England to South Africa, they would refuse to found schools there. We are willing to believe that now, as in the first century, they would follow the leadings of Providence, and strive by all wise means to save some of those by whom they were surrounded.

But, says Dr. Wayland, in the report alluded to, "It is certainly wrong to ordain ministers and send them forth as preachers of the gospel under the Saviour's commission, when we only mean them to be school teachers." And again: "Who shall labor in the work of education? (i. e. after Christianity has been planted on a foreign soil.) If the views just expressed be correct, it will follow, that this is a work not to be devolved on the ministers of the Gospel." Truly this is a remarkable proposition to emanate from a New England college. The fathers of that favored portion of our country seemed to have no such scruples, when they called ordained men to undertake the training of youth in old Yale and Harvard. Nor, in later times, have their successors withheld from these and younger seminaries of learning their most gifted pulpit orators and scholars. Certainly no such theory was held by our Presbyterian fathers, who hesitated not to place in educational chairs, the most useful and eminent of their ordained pastors, or even to call the great Edwards from his Mission to the Indians to preside in the College of Nassau Hall. And with the highest admiration for the character, and most heartfelt esteem for the services of the distinguished author of the sentiment we have quoted, we cannot avoid an expression of surprise that it should have come from the Reverend President of Brown University. The very extent of the indebtedness of the cause of education to the labors of his best years makes it the more unaccountable. Will it be said that it is the MISSIONARY of whom we are talking—that circumstances are widely different at home? And is it so, that apostolic precedent is outlawed

from America? Is it only to be made an unbending rule for the evangelist sent to heathen India? Is he to be shut up to one way of reaching the heart and one mode of doing good, whilst the Christian ministers of America may range over the whole field of useful effort and adapt their powers to separate spheres of action, as God and his people shall direct? Must the man who single handed and alone is to do every thing, under God to raise a nation from the depths of a degraded idolatry to Christian life and light, be restricted to a single instrument, whilst we at home may bend every agency and apply every new power to the accomplishment of a lighter task? No! This were a monstrous wrong! In the name of justice, we demand, that if restriction be laid any where, it be not upon the man who, with the least assistance, has the greatest and hardest work to do. We say not now what it is wisest for him to do, but we protest against this laying down of restrictions for the missionary, whilst leaving to his brother in Christian lands a margin of the widest liberty.

Many important topics suggest themselves in this conection; but we may not linger here, lest we exceed the limits to which we can lay claim. With a few remarks on the Rules of the Arcot Mission, given on a proceeding page, we pass to another part of our subject. With the Preamble we, in the main, heartily agree. The acessibility of India; the ability of the Hindus to comprehend Gospel truths; their fitness to hear them proclaimed, and the prime importance of the preaching of these truths to the masses in their own tongue, are points we have no desire to dispute. We know of no American mission in which they would not be heartly endorsed. The seventh section, however, records a more "definite plan of missionary labor," as enjoined by Christ's commission to the Apostles than we have been wont to find in those simple yet comprehensive words. With this, however, we shall not quarrel, as it merely expresses the belief of the members of the Arcot Mission in the year 1853 as to the teachings of the Redeemer's last command. Neither shall we dispute the right of these brethren to lay down rules for their guidance in the prosecution of their work in accord-

ance with their views of the true theory of missions. Rather would we wish them God speed in their labors, and rejoice in their success.

So long as the Mission is fully agreed in this matter, we should have no disposition to compel it "to encumber itself with educational establishments for heathen youth." (See Resolutions on a former page.) Nor if, when a Christian community, by the blessing of God upon the preaching of his Word, had grown up, and educational institutions had been established for it, a child of heathen parents should knock at the door and implore admittance, the reply should be, "We have no place in our scheme for the instruction of heathen youth—all such institutions in this Mission are 'strictly limited to baptized children and to children of proselytes,'" should we wish to dispute their right to decide this question thus, so far as the Arcot Mission is concerned. But if the demand be made that the spirit of these rules be subscribed to by the Missions at Madras, Madura, Jaffna, Bombay; nay, by all missions in the whole world, as the *only divinely appointed made of evangelization*, then we must protest against so unwarranted an assumption of exclusive apostolicity.

The merits of the question, as to the wisdom or otherwise of the use of educational establishments in our missions, will be involved in some remarks to be made before we close.

That which most practically interests us in this matter is the course pursued by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. It is through this organization that we have for many years done all that we have done for the evangelization of heathen lands. It is to its discretion that we now entrust our contributions of money. It is for its missions especially that our prayers are offered up; and it is to its care that we commit our brethren who devote themselves to this work. Hence, the views and policy of the American Board are to us matters of the weightiest interest. They should receive our closest attention, if we would do our duty to the cause of missions, and to those whom we send forth in this glorious work. To which then of the two differing theories which have been

sketched does this Board incline. What views as to modes of missionary action are held by its controlling powers? In reply, it may be said, that the course pursued by the Board from its organization has been a mean between these two extremes. Rejecting no instrumentality that gave promise of doing good service to the cause, it has used them all. Its object, as defined by its published laws and regulations, is, "to propagate the gospel among the unevangelized nations and communities, by means of preachers, catechists, school-masters, and the press." The missionaries have had a reasonable liberty to make use of all of these modes of reaching and influencing the people to whom they have been sent, and this liberty they have used, although with a varying amount of attention to the several branches of effort in different lands and missions. The propriety of the use of schools in connection with preaching, as a branch of evangelic effort, was ably advocated in an Article written by the Rev. Dr. Anderson, Senior Secretary of the Board, and published in the Biblical Repository of the year 1838. The views there devoloped are those upon which the missions of the American Board were conducted from their incipiency. Schools for heathen youth formed a part of the equipment of almost every station, and the hopes of success cherished by the friends of the cause at home were partly based upon the fruits anticipated from the Christian training of the young.

With the increase of experience in the work, and under the incentives to inquiry as to the modes already adverted to, it was to be expected that the guiding spirits of this great Missionary society, should be led to examine the principles upon which its operations were based. That old views should be modified, or new views embraced, need be no matter of wonder. But it will be as little matter for wonder, that the Churches acting through their Board, should claim the right to know the changes proposed or effected, to discuss the grounds upon which such changes are founded, and to decide whether the principles involved shall be adopted as the policy of their missions to the heathen. It is not our privilege only, it is our sacred duty to understand the theories and the practice of our

foreign missionaries, to be fully in sympathy with them and their work, and to supervise their labors as truly as we do that of the home missionary—a duty, it must be said, which has been most shamefully neglected by our church judicatories.

For several years past it has been evident to those sufficiently interested to observe the course of things, that the views of the Prudential Committee have been inclining to what may be, for brevity, styled the anti-educational side of the question. This was particularly noticeable in the instructions of the Committee, given by Dr. Anderson, in December, 1848, to the first missionaries to the Jews of Salonica. The missionaries were distinctly instructed, that the Committee were not prepared to institute schools of any sort in the new mission. In the management of other missions of the Board also, the influence of the Committee has been decidedly adverse to any extension of the educational system, as a means of evangelization, and more particularly so to the use of the English language as a medium of instruction. For many years, if we are correctly informed, the school system has been a subject of correspondence between the Missions and the Committee. Especially is this true of our Indian Missions. In that particularly difficult and interesting field of effort, with a population so vast, so strangely bound by caste, so subtle, so full of pride in a venerable system of false religion and false science ; the literary and scientific, as well as religious superiority of Christianity, has been largely brought to bear upon the people. The Committee, year by year, have seemed to place less and less confidence in educational means, and to be more and more disposed to confine missionary labor, as a part of a system of evangelization, to the preaching of the Gospel to adults. The great majority, we believe, of the missionaries of all Societies in India, have felt themselves unable to see the wisdom of this position. Whilst maintaining that the public oral proclamation of the truth was the first thing in missions, they have not felt that it was every thing or the only thing. Hence, there has been a reluctance on the part of the missionaries of the American Board, to adopt measures

entirely in accordance with the views of the Committee. Nor do we know that the Committee have demanded this. Whilst seeking to keep educational operations within what seem to them proper limits, and perhaps depressing it below what some of the missions have deemed the truest policy and economy, we do not know that they have demanded an entire change of policy in any mission.

So great was the difficulty of deciding and adjusting this and other matters by correspondence alone, that it seemed advisable to the Prudential Committee to send out a deputation to visit and confer with their missionaries in Hindustan. Accordingly the Rev. Dr. Anderson, Secretary, and the Rev. Augustus C. Thompson, of Roxbury, Massachusetts, a member of the Committee, sailed for India, by the way of England, in August, 1854.

The objects of the Deputation are thus stated in the Annual Report for 1854: "This measure is regarded by the Prudential Committee as being every way economical and wise; there being many questions, connected with considerable outlay of funds, which it is desirable to hasten to an earlier and more satisfactory adjustment than can be effected through the medium of written correspondence, or of converse with individual missionaries returning from their fields; such as the place which schools and education should hold among the means for evangelizing the people of India; the comparative use that should be made of the English and of the vernacular languages in education; the most economical and effectual method of training native preachers, pastors, and helpers; the inquiry as to the expediency of a more rapid and extensive institution of a native pastorate, with the whole subject of the support of native evangelical laborers; the providing of houses for preaching and public worship:" together with the provision to be made for Christian communities; the use of the press; relations to other societies, and the comparative importance of different fields of labor.

Here, it will be seen, is a schedule of topics of the highest

importance, and of topics upon which it is of great moment that the Committee should have a personal intelligence. It is so utterly impossible to obtain a satisfactory understanding of these matters without a personal acquaintance with the fields and people, without looking the thing itself in the face, that the sending of their Senior Secretary, with a member of the Committee to visit the Indian Missions, is an act at once natural and wise. A personal interview with the men who have been spending their lives in the work, upon the ground and among the people, it might be expected, would give to a Secretary more real information than volumes of correspondence, whilst it would also afford him an opportunity for more fully unfolding to the Missionaries his own views. After such a visit, the letters written would come with an appreciable reality and instructiveness not before possessed. At the same time, a sympathy between the patrons and officers of the Society at home, and the laborious agents abroad, would be engendered, that would do much to hold up the hands ready to fail, and to cheer the weary heart of the oft anxious and care-worn missionary.

When, however, at the annual meeting of the Board, held at Hartford, in September, 1854, a few weeks after the departure of the Deputation for India, a special Report on the "Divine Instrumentality for the World's Conversion," was read by one of the Secretaries of the Board on behalf of the Prudential Committee, it was appehended by those conversant with the state of things, that the Deputation had not gone out so much to learn, as to teach—so much to consult as to act. Although the spirit of the Report is most excellent, and its positions, in the main, such as few would dissent from, yet, discussing as it did the question in debate between the Missions and the Committee, and coming, as it did, immediately upon the departure of the Deputation, it appeared to be designed to prepare the public mind for action already decided upon. This apprehension, whether well or ill-founded, would seem to be justified by the reports of the movements of the Deputation so far as received. At the late meeting of the

Board, in Utica the belief that changes had been effected in the policy of the India Missions, in accordance with pre-conceived theories of the Committee and its Secretaries, rather than as the result of a change of views on the part of its missionaries, was manifest. Regret was felt and expressed that the matter had not been communicated to the Board before action was had. Although it appeared to be too late to arrest such action, in part, at least, it having been already taken, it was manifestly the will of the meeting that, so far as possible, all of the proposed alterations should be suspended until the decision of the Board could be had upon them. From the special meeting to be called upon the return of the Deputation, we hope for good results. A kindly discussion of the principles upon which our missions are conducted and should be conducted, must lead to the happiest results. The Churches supporting the missions of the American Board, claim the right both of understanding these principles and of expressing their views upon any questions involving a just and wise management of the affairs of the Board, with the expectation that their wishes will be respected. They can only be led suitably to sympathize with the work of foreign missions, and properly to contribute men and means wherewith to carry it forward, by being made intelligently familiar with the subject, and by being satisfied of the wisdom of the policy pursued by those to whom it is more immediately committed. The churches must feel that these missions are *their* missions, if we would have them give to the cause the attention and support it merits. Therefore it is, that as friends of the noble cause of missions to the heathen, we rejoice that the whole subject is to be so prominently brought before the constituency of the American Board. We trust that the promotion of the cause of Christ, and no lower aim, will be in the eye of the Board at its special meeting. We have no desire to prejudge the matter, nor to censure the Committee or its excellent officers, but we sincerely desire that an intelligent review of this subject may be had, both as a matter of justice to the cause of foreign missions, and to those devoted to its advancement at home and abroad.

The changes brought about by the visit of the Deputation have not been confined to the Ceylon mission, as has been supposed by many; changes analogous in character have been found desirable in missions on both sides of India. In the Mahratta missions of the Bombay presidency, and in the Tamil mission of the district of Madura, unless we are misinformed, an essential reduction has been determined upon in the educational department of the missionary work. Instruction in English is to cease, the number of the schools to be diminished, and the reception of pupils in the remaining schools to be confined as soon as possible to the children of real or nominal Christians. The school is to follow, not precede, evangelization. The printing of English by mission presses is to be discontinued, and the management of these presses to be given to natives. The churches are to be committed to the care of native pastors as soon as possible, and the missionary to become an Evangelist with an episcopal charge of the Churches. In the preparation of young men for the ministry, if any are instructed in the English language, it is to be as an exceptional rather than a normal feature of the work.

Since the educational system has been most steadily, extensively, and we may add successfully, used in the Jaffna Mission, the greatest amount of change was needed there to bring the Mission to the shape deemed most desirable by the Deputation. We learn from the Missionary Herald for September last, that the conference of the Mission with the Deputation resulted in a complete conversion of the Jaffna brethren to the views of the Deputation, a result equally surprising to those engaged in the conference and to the more distant friends of the Mission at home. A brief sketch of the history of this Mission is essential to an understanding either of the necessity or nature of the changes thus effected.

The Jaffna Mission was commenced in March, 1816, by Messrs. Warren, Richards, Poor and Meigs, of whom the last named only survives. The Mission has of late years had from seven to nine ordained missionaries, a physican and printer. The field of labor assigned to these brethren and their succes-

sors,—the northern Province of Ceylon,—is in several respects a peculiar one, differing in important particulars from mission fields upon the continent of India. These peculiarities have had an influence in modifying the means used in the work of evangelization. From the outset the Mission has made use of preaching, the press and education, as mutual aids in prosecuting its enterprise. Although education in schools of different grades has been a more prominent agency in this than in some other of our Indian Missions, it is the assertion of our brethren that the preaching of the Gospel has ever been their chief instrumentality. Thus, in their report published at the close of the year 1846, they say, under the head of "Preaching"—"By this is to be understood the oral declaration of the Gospel to one or more auditors, but not necessarily in the ordinary form of sermonizing. The missionaries regard their churches, school bungalows, rest houses and dwelling houses, the wayside and bazars, as proper places in which to preach the Gospel, and accordingly they have from the beginning exercised their ministry in all these places as they had opportunity." Again, in the report of 1852, they say—"The preaching of the Gospel in the Churches and in the villages, by the wayside and from house to house, *has always been considered our great instrumentality* for the spread of the truth, and educational and other means only as auxiliary to this."

The accounts of extended tours found in the reports of other missions cannot be looked for here from the insular nature of the field. The compactness of its population, whilst preventing the necessity for such tours, taken in connection with the state of preparation for receiving the truth, produced by the preaching and teaching of past years, says this report, "creates a demand for daily excursions in the villages, the results of which are not to be estimated by the distance traveled. Thus, at Manepy, there are ten thousand inhabitants within the limits of the station, and yet so compact, that the most distant are within an half hour's ride from the station. Every house is open to the missionaries, and every family an audience." Dr. Poor, then in charge of that station, visited, during the last six

months preceding the report, two hundred houses, nearly in the order of their location. Those familiar with the difficulty of getting access to houses of the Hindus elsewhere, will recognize in this fact a remarkable proof of progress. Mr. Meigs, the surviving founder of the mission, says—"During good weather we hold meetings, usually in the evenings, at our school bungalows, and sometimes at the houses of respectable natives in the villages." Tours upon the neighboring islands also are made both by the missionaries and native preachers.

The Christian education of the rising generation, though regarded only as an auxiliary to the great work of preaching the Gospel, has ever been a prominent feature in the operation of the Jaffna mission. The Schools are of three grades. In the lowest, or common schools, Tamil only is taught; the branches studied being simple and elementary, with a large proportion of religious instruction from the Scriptures and Catechisms. These are taught entirely by natives, who bring their pupils for examination and instruction weekly to the missionary, and on the Sabbath to the station church. Next above these schools, are those in which English, as well as Tamil, is taught, of which there is one at each station. These are designed to be feeders to the Seminary. The best boys from the village school enter the English school, and of these a select number are admitted to the Seminary. The expense of these schools is mostly borne by an appropriation of £200 per annum from the British Government, and the instruction is given almost entirely by native teachers. It is the aim of these schools to confer a thorough biblical education, as well as one that will be useful to the pupil in any position in life, should he fail to enter the Seminary. The female Boarding School at Oodooville, and the male Seminary at Batticotta, complete the educational system of the mission. The Boarding school was commenced in 1824. At that time there could hardly be found a native female in the Jaffna district who knew the Tamil alphabet. So great was the prejudice against female education, that it was with the greatest difficulty, and with the promise of a marriage dowry,

that a few little girls could be induced to encounter the odium of learning to read, and their parents be persuaded to allow them to be under instruction. Now, so great is the pressure of candidates for admittance to the Oodooville school, that in place of receiving a dower the pupils pay a portion of the expenses, and many who apply must be rejected to keep the school within the prescribed limits. From this school are furnished wives of native preachers, catechists, teachers, and educated young men. It is a fact that speaks most loudly in favor of this institution, that of two hundred and four females who have gone out from it, one hundred and thirty-six were church members when they left the school, and, up to 1852, thirteen others had united with the church, giving as the result of this training mainly of heathen girls, about three-fourths of the whole number as making a profession of faith. Of these but ten have gone back to heathenism, though almost all live among heathen friends, exposed to constant ridicule and annoyance.

The Batticotta Seminary was commenced in 1823, as a central high school for lads who, at the several stations, were prepared for a course of instruction which would call for more of the missionaries' time than could be afforded from their other duties. That they might not lose these youth, nor uneconomically withdraw labor from other parts of the work, forty-eight of the most promising pupils were consolidated into one seminary, under the care of the late Dr. Poor. "The main design of the Seminary," say the mission, "has been to bring forward competent native agents for the missionary work. The pupils are required to attend public worship on the Sabbath, and such other religious services as may be appointed for their benefit. Attendance on idolatrous ceremonies is a disciplinable offence. The great object of the institution being the propagation of Christianity, the Bible has always been a prominent object of study, and is regarded as the text-book on morals and religion. Science is taught, principally, as an auxiliary to this object." The course embraces eight years, the studies being quite extended

and embracing instruction both in English and Tamil. The former is considered as an eminently desirable feature in the culture of Hindu youth,—as opening a store-house of thought, of mental, moral, civil and religious material, without a parallel—as the only effectual means of bringing these minds into contact and practical acquaintance with the energy, the enterprise and the benevolence of Protestant Christendom—as an invaluable stimulant, awakening the mind to the pursuit of every branch of learning, and as a means of lifting the mind out of the pits of heathen associations, especially in reading the (English) Bible. As in the Oodooville school, so in the seminary, a most remarkable index is furnished of the change that has taken place in the popular mind of the Province. Whereas, at first, pupils could be obtained only with the greatest difficulty, at an examination in 1852, for the admission of thirty lads, who were to pay the whole or a part of their expenses for board, there were eighty candidates for the privilege of entering this Christian school. The instruction given in this Seminary has resulted in the education, full or partial, of 670 pupils. Excluding 100 connected with the Seminary when it was broken up, and 75 dismissed early in their course for misconduct or deficient scholarship, we have 495, of whom 340 are or have been church members. Of the 366 young men who remained in the Seminary for five years or more, 256 were admitted to the church. Of the whole number 270 have been in mission service at some time, of whom 50 have died, and in 1854 as many as 134 of the pupils of this institution were engaged in labors connected with missionary effort.

Though this bare statement is far from showing what has been actually effected by the Seminary, it is a most significant index to the spirit in which its affairs have been conducted. The Oodooville School for girls,* and the Batticotta Seminary

* This is not strictly correct, since the Missionary in charge of the Oodooville station, the Rev. Mr. Spaulding, whilst exercising a religious supervision of the school, in no degree falls short of any of his brethren in preaching, translating and pastoral labors. The temporal cares of the school and even the keeping of accounts devolve upon Mrs. Spaulding and her coadjutor, Miss Agnew.

for young men, have each demanded the services of a missionary family. For a while the latter was thought worthy of more ministerial labor, but generally it has had but one ordained missionary. The other ordained members of the mission have had the charge each of a station with its church, out-door preaching, visitation, and the superintendence of schools for the children of Christians and heathen. With regard to schools, it should be borne in mind, that of late years very little of the secular instruction in the seminaries has been given by the missionaries. Native teachers are now qualified for these departments, and the missionary can lay out his strength in the inculcation of moral and religious studies, which are taught in these institutions to a far greater extent than in any American college, we might perhaps say than in any American school. In the station, or day schools, the missionary does not think of teaching. Religious instruction and examination are the only errands that take him to the school, or bring the school to him. It is a remarkable fact, that more persons have embraced Christianity from the two Seminaries than as the result of all the other labors of the Mission. In fact, not one-third of the converts in this Mission are the fruits of preaching alone.* Undoubtedly it is to the early instruction received in Christianity by those entering the Seminaries, that this must be attributed. Having been brought in the village and higher schools to a state resembling somewhat that of youth in a Christian community, the preaching of the word, when rejected by adult hearers, has proved, under God, effectual with them.

The changes made by the joint action of the Deputation and the Mission seem to have been of a sweeping nature :

(1.) The ecclesiastical body, called the "Jaffna Consociation or Presbytery," by which the purely ecclesiastical matters of the Mission had been managed, is dissolved, and the

* Of 825 admitted to the Jaffna churches up to the year 1854, 352 were from the Batticotta Seminary, and 185 from Oodooville. Of the remaining 288 church members, 80 had been teachers, and at least 60 pupils in the village or station schools.

missionaries organized into a separate church. The ecclesiastical functions necessary to the work, will be assumed by the Mission as such. The churches are as rapidly as possible to be put under the pastoral care of natives, the missionaries devoting their time to preaching to unconverted adults, who are to be organized into churches as fast as six or more Christians shall be found in one place, and then given to the charge of native preachers and catechists.

(2.) All education is to be hereafter in the vernacular of the district, (Tamil,) and confined mainly to the children of Christians. Heretofore the village schools have been taught by natives, and, except in special cases, in the vernacular. At first, from lack of Christians, heathen men were thus employed by the Mission to gain a foot-hold in the villages, and to reach the young by schools as well as adults by preaching. By degrees Christian teachers had replaced the former class in most places, and schools were established into which the children of Christians and heathen were both admitted freely. Now these schools are to be mainly confined to villages in which there are converts, nominal or real, and to be for the instruction of their children. In the second grade of schools, one at each station, of late years supported by a grant of £200 annually from the British Government, English is no longer to be taught, and the Government grant of course relinquished. An effort is to be made to raise the standard of vernacular scholarship in these schools. The Oodooville Female Boarding School, now numbering seventy pupils, is to be reduced by the graduation of the present classes to thirty or thirty-five, the course shortened, English discontinued, and the children of Christians only admitted. In the Batticotta Seminary, it was decided to reduce the number of pupils from one hundred to twenty-five or thirty, and to shorten the term of study; to give instruction only in Tamil, and that to Christians or the children of Christians only, with a view to their preparation for mission service. The Mission not being able at present to organize the Seminary on this basis,—as was suggested in the September Missionary Herald, —have decided to disband it altogether.

(3.) As printing in English is to be discontinued, the mission press has been transferred to natives. The missionary printer is to be ordained and transferred to the Madura mission.

The wisdom of these measures it is not our present purpose to discuss. The return of the Deputation and the publication of their Report will afford the proper occasion for hearing what may be said on either hand. We have no doubt that a just measure of attention will be bestowed upon the subject, and both the experience of the past, and the wisdom of the present, be fairly weighed by the Board. We would deprecate a censorious pre-judgment of the acts of the Deputation, or a captious criticism of the course of the Prudential Committee. A large confidence must necessarily be reposed in the executive officers of our benevolent societies, if we would have them efficient. This confidence is due to the Committee who have so ably managed the affairs of the American Board, and to the distinguished Christian gentleman who has for so many years devoted his whole powers to its cause, as the Secretary for Foreign Correspondence. A thorough discussion of the subject we desire to see; but not in a spirit of needless fault finding, or intermeddling with the measures of those who have been entrusted by the Churches with a responsibility so great—a responsibility which has been well and nobly met.

It may, in passing, be remarked, that these changes were not called for by the convictions of the older missionaries. There can be no doubt, we think, that some of them concurred in the alterations proposed from an unwillingness to appear contumacious, and from a willingness to yield their own preferences, rather than from a conviction of the wisdom of the new measures proposed and inaugurated. It will create no astonishment if we learn that aged hearts are sore, and venerable eyes suffused with tears at the prospect of the reduction or abandonment of the institutions over which they have wept, and prayed and yearned. Nor will such yearnings of heart be deemed inconsistent with a graceful acquiescence in the will

of the Deputation, and of the majority of the Mission. Nor were the changes caused by an increase of educational labors on the part of the Jaffna mission. For ten years past the process has been one of reduction. The maximum was in 1842, not in 1855. Batticotta Seminary had been reduced from 180 to 100 pupils, and its expenses lessened two thirds; Oodooville Boarding School from 100 girls to 75; the village schools from 6000 to less than 4000 children. It may also be remarked, that the system of educational effort so long pursued in the Province of Ceylon, but now repudiated by some as unscriptural and unwise, has indisputably prepared the way for the more hopeful prosecution of the present plan. It is not as in Arcot, an experiment on its own foundation, but upon the labors of the fathers of the Mission, passed or passing away. Many of the hearers of the Word now have their minds informed and their consciences enlightened, by contact with scripture truth in mission schools. These will be found by the evangelist to be his most intelligent auditors, and we may hope that the teachings of the past will not be wholly thrown away. The prayers and tears that have consecrated the soil of Jaffna; the precious dust that is there awaiting the archangel's trump; the toils and trials there endured, will not, cannot be forgotten of God. Our wisdom and our folly are the tossings of the wind-driven wave—His purposes, and His mercy are as the ocean depths unchangeable. The day will yet dawn, when, in spite of our folly, or irrespective of our wisdom, He shall reign over the inhabitants of now besotted India.

We conclude with a few of the many thoughts that crowd upon us and claim an utterance, choosing rather to seem to overlook many important points than to exhaust the patience of our readers by undue length.

(1.) *Let a comprehensive view of the subject be taken.* It is no petty effort of which we treat, no small undertaking that we discuss. Vast as is the importance, unutterable as is the preciousness of the salvation of a single soul, and still more of many souls, even this is an object far outweighed in magnitude, by the issue of our efforts for the conversion of a world

lying in wickedness. Our aim is not to run over so many provinces, to address so many assemblies, to scatter so many Scriptures and tracts, to educate so many children, nor even to save so many souls, in themselves considered. It is deeper, broader, more far-reaching than this—*it is to plant the Church of Christ in heathen lands.* To plant it, not as an exotic, to be fostered by the appliances of foreign skill and culture, but to plant it so that it shall live and propagate itself, and hand down to coming generations the ordinances of the house of God. Until we reach this point we have not done our work. To save souls is a high aim, but beyond this to plant a self-propagative church is that which we proposed to ourselves in our Foreign Missions.

(2.) *Let thorough work be made as far as we go.* It is no uncommon thing that efforts to save the perishing from temporal death are defeated by the attempt to rescue too many at once. To save all is the ultimate aim; but to do that we must take from the wreck, at one time, no more than our life-boat can sustain. It seems hard-hearted to refuse to admit any poor wretch trembling in the jaws of death, but it is the part of true mercy only to undertake what we can carry through successfully. Let us therefore take our position, undertake a given field, or a given number of fields, and in the name of our God determine to do our duty to those fields. Let not the invitingness of another and another call, lead us so to encumber ourselves with new enterprises, that old ones shall not be properly prosecuted. A concentrated effort is essential, when the disposable forces are so small.

(3.) *Let our missionaries be amply furnished with instruments for the prosecution of their enterprise.* The missionary is a costly article. He is obtained with difficulty, fitted for his work by a long course of training, sent out at a large expense, maintained in a hostile climate, with a constant struggle against debility and disease, and liable to be removed by illness, or suddenly cut off by death. Hence it is wisdom to give him all the tools he needs. It is economy. This is true of the home pastor, but pre-eminently true of the foreign mis-

sionary, who labors without the aid of intelligent church officers, church members, and Sabbath-school teachers, who at home surround and sustain the minister of the Gospel.

The foreign missionary must do every thing without these aids. Hence he needs all the appliances that can be afforded him for the performance of his task. To send out men and then say we cannot furnish them with weapons, is to enact the folly of sending forth to reduce an empire, an army without artillery, or a general without troops. To deprive the laborer of his tools, the soldier of his weapons, is the poorest of all modes of retrenchment.

(4.) Having chosen our field and obtained our men, *let us use the wisest means*. The Gospel is our weapon. To bring it in all respects most effectually to bear upon men, is our object. The public oral proclamation of the truth is undoubtedly the first great means for the conversion of men. Its simplicity, its unworldliness, its inefficiency, without the blessing of God, its apostolicity, its direct obedience to the command of Christ, all combine to render it a God-honoring means, and a glorious privilege of the man of God in every land. God forbid that we or our missionaries should decry or disparage it. We do not believe that they do disparage it. We have yet to learn of a mission of the American Board, in which the preaching of Christ publicly and privately, in the village and the city, in the street and from house to house, is not regarded as the chief means for the conversion of rebellious men to God. Deeply should we regret any departure from this cardinal truth. But let us not be so carried away with a passion for a supposed apostolic method, as to reject the means for reaching the consciences of men put into our hands by the Providence of God. True apostolicity is to do all that we can, and look to God for his blessing.

The missionary, it must be borne in mind, cannot do what we can. He has no prescriptive rights like those with which the American pastor is invested. He has not the avenues for usefulness and ministerial effort all opened before him. He is a stranger, a foreigner, in spiritual things a foe to the peo-

ple among whom he dwells. He must watch the indications of Providence. He must enter every open door. He must avail himself of every means of access to the minds and hearts of the people. Hence, let him, in the exercise of a wise discretion, in connection with the public preaching of the word, *use all means* for bringing the truth to bear upon those among whom he has chosen to pitch his tent. Let him make use of the press, of schools, of medicine, of any thing lawful, for the advancement of his cause.

*Schools are a lawful and may be an important branch of the machinery of missions*, both as one of the appliances of a well balanced system of evangelistic operations, and as a means of training native teachers, preachers, and pastors. A system of missions which ignores the younger half of the human race, appears to us to involve an error of no slight magnitude. To confine our efforts to adults, is to turn from that half of the population of any land which is most impressible, least under the power of sin and idolatry, and which is in a few short years to be the acting, ruling generation. To say that young converts are not the ones to withstand the outbursts of persecuting rage, or that children and youth are not in fact the persons converted in missions, seems not to us to correspond with the voice of history. If the young are not converted, it is because we do not seek their conversion aright, and with faith in the power of God. Who does not know, that when efforts are put forth for their benefit, it is from the ranks of the young that we reap our richest harvests!

To say that youth, instructed in the Scriptures, are not more hopeful subjects for the preacher than those utterly ignorant of the principles and facts of Christianity, is to contradict experience and common sense. Yet a distinguished advocate of another system of missions, already quoted,* says, "If we instruct them, they remain estranged from God, just as they were before. We have, therefore, approached

* Rev. Dr. Wayland.

no nearer to the end which we have in view than when we commenced." And is it so? Is instruction thrown away, that does not result in immediate conversion? Is the hardened idolator of threescore years as near to the kingdom of heaven, as the youth whose conscience has been awakened, and whose mind has been enlightened by years of contact with the Christian Scriptures? And shall our mouths be closed because we are told in reply, "Yes, for, to infinite power, all things are equally easy!" Who pretends that God cannot abrogate his own laws, reverse the plan in which he has regulated the affairs of this world for six thousand years, and ordain that the present relations of cause and effect shall cease? Who denies the power of God to do this if he will? But, because God is an Almighty Sovereign, shall we neglect the teachings of reason and experience as to his modes of acting? To do so were to abandon His guidance, and to open the door for every extravagance of a wild fanaticism. How is it in this land? Do we not recognize the vantage ground gained, when we can reach and affect the young? Do we not find the Sabbath school, and especially the mission Sabbath school, an agency for invading the ranks of the ungodly in their most vulnerable part? Our schools and colleges, our female seminaries and institutions, do they not present most hopeful audiences to the preacher of the truth? To argue the point would seem superfluous. Let any man visit a well-trained Sunday school, with three hundred children, gathered largely from the homes of the irreligious, in any of our cities, and he will feel it impossible to deny the wisdom of the effort. And then let him go with us to the Bhowanipoor schools of the London Mission in Calcutta, and look upon six hundred boys and youth from the homes of Hindu idolatry, engaged in Christian study, orderly, attentive, with intelligence and joy in the consciousness of mental enlargement beaming in every face, and his heart will have some strange idiosyncrasy of structure, if it does not beat with glad emotion and swell with gratitude to God for giving his servants access to these tender minds. Let him then go to the Scotch Assembly's

school, on Cornwallis Square, and look on a thousand youth thus engaged; and then to the Neemtollah school of the Free Church, and see twelve hundred more, gathered in one building, from the highest castes, the proudest tribes, the most bigoted families, to sit for years under the teachings of Duff and his colleagues; and then let him pray, if he will, that these assemblages may be broken up as a useless waste of effort. For ourselves, we must decline to cry "*Amen*" to such a petition.

Schools give the missionary access to the young, who are one-half the population of the globe; they prepare for him intelligent hearers, they create appreciative readers, they give access directly and indirectly to parents, they exercise the young missionary in the languages, and they bring souls to Christ. Hence we deem them a proper part of a wise and comprehensive system of evangelistic effort. A mission may devote too large a proportion of its strength to schools, but that would not justify us in rejecting their judicious use.

Aside from these general advantages, arising from a proper use of schools in our missionary operations, they subserve a specific end of the highest importance; we refer to the raising up of a native ministry, teachers, preachers and pastors. To preserve and hand down the Gospel, with its ordinances and institutions, is the highest function of the infant church raised up by the preaching of the foreign evangelist. For this an educated ministry is needful. It may please God occasionally to introduce a man to this work suddenly; and after a life spent in circumstances unfavorable to the mental and moral training adapted to prepare him for it, He may make him abundantly useful. As a general thing, however, we are not warranted in expecting such results. The experience of the Church abundantly demonstrates the necessity of a thorough training for those to whom this responsible charge is to be committed. If this be true in Christian lands, much more is it true among the heathen. Whilst all in such a land as ours receive insensibly and inevitably a diffused moral training, the result of past ages of Christian faith and practice handed

down to the present, the heathen inhales with his first breath an atmosphere of mental and moral debasement, in which he ever after lives and moves. It is thus rendered doubly desirable that those who are to be the pillars of the church in heathen lands, should, at as early an age as possible, be brought under the influence of a Christian training. We cannot undertake to educate a nation, but by a wise system of educational efforts we may hope to train a considerable number, of whom a portion may be selected for farther instruction, and some be led by the Spirit of God to give themselves to the work of the ministry. Without being able to state as a fact, what could not be embraced in ordinary statistics, it is our impression that almost all of the fifty or more ordained natives of Hindustan are the fruits of a long course of scholastic training.

Whether or not the English language should be taught in mission schools, is a question much debated, but one upon which we cannot now enter. It may be said, in passing, that, aside from the merits of the discussion on the abstract question, there is a state of things now existing in India which, so far as that country is concerned, must be taken into the account. Among the higher classes, and those almost inaccessible to the missionary, more especially in the cities, there exists a passion for the acquisition of the English language. It is the language of their rulers, of the courts, and of almost all proceedings in which they come in contact with Government. It is the language of Western science and of the road to wealth. Hence the most bigoted, even Brahmins, will gladly send their sons to any school in which this coveted accomplishment may be gained. If the Christian missionary opens a school in which English is taught, it will be crowded with young Hindus, whose fathers are willing to run the risk of their conversion that they may make the acquisition of this passport to station, wealth, and influence. The missionary may avow his object, make Christianity the first and last thing in his instructions, require attendance upon public worship, and the study of the Scriptures every day, and yet his rooms will be filled with lads of all castes, from the Brahmin down to the Pariah. This re-

markable fact cannot be overlooked by men upon the field. It has led to the establishment of mission schools in Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and other large cities, in which, by the attraction of English, thousands of Hindu youth are brought under the direct influence of missionaries. These schools have been most largely used by the Scotch missionaries, in accordance with their chosen theory of missions. Others, partly from sympathy with these views, and partly from a desire to enter an open door of usefulness, have also engaged in this enterprise. At present, the representatives of all the great English, Scotch, and Continental Societies in the large cities are making use of these English schools as a means of reaching and affecting the popular mind. The influence of these efforts is most manifest. Nothing has struck a more deadly blow at Hinduism than the teaching thus imparted. It is not a work of unmixed good in its results, for some cast off heathenism for infidelity, and others are hardened by appeals to which they will not yield. If, however, these results be urged as fatal objections to this mode of effort, then may we show the inexpediency of all labors which prove "to some a savor of death unto death." The truth is, English they will have. If the missionary will not give it to them, others will. If they do not get it from us, they will from the heathen schools established by Hindus, and the godless universities sustained by Government.

In conclusion, we would say, *let us have, if possible, a system of well-balanced missions.* By this we mean missions comprehending in their scope the different parts of a wise system of effort for the conversion of men, the training of a native ministry, and the establishment of a self-perpetuating Church. We cannot coincide with Dr. Duff in his views, for he seems to confine the labors of the foreign missionary to one portion of his calling to the neglect of others; nor can we agree with those who pass to the opposite extreme. The school system of Dr. Duff, if chosen by a given mission on the principle of a division of labor,—they offering to do that part of the whole work,—may be very well; but if it be claimed as a complete

system of Foreign Missions, then we must feel that the first work of the missionary is left undone. If, on the other hand, itinerancy is made the sum and substance of our duty, we think that a similar mistake is made. We therefore advocate the formation of well-balanced and comprehensive missions, in which every department of labor shall receive its due proportion of attention. Thus will we combine in one harmonious effort, those modes of labor which, when isolated and magnified so as to cover the whole ground of duty, seem antagonistic, but when united, are found to be mutually helpful allies. God has not given to all men one gift, nor cast all men in one mould. The attempt to confine all to one mode of labor will always result in discontent and often in defeat. As gifts are diverse, so are the parts of the great word to be done. Let us, then, seek to give each man his place, and each place its man; using the talent of each to its utmost, and turning from no lawful agency for the accomplishment of our high end. In so doing, we may humbly imitate the great Giver of gifts unto men, who "gave some apostles ; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

# SWEDENBORGIANISM

NOT

# CHRISTIANITY.

A

# LECTURE,

**Delivered in Peoria, January 8th,**

AND

**Subsequently by Request, January 29th.**

---

The author, in preparing this Lecture, was *essentially aided* by Dr. Pond's able and just review of Swedenborgianism.

---

**PEORIA:**
RANEY & HILDRETH.
MORNING NEWS JOB OFFICE.
1854.

# PREFACE.

The author of this lecture having been publicly denounced before the citizens of Peoria, directly or indirectly, as a *liar*, a *slanderer*, as *morally dishonest*, and as guilty of *wilful misrepresentations*, was requested, by many friends, to *re-deliver* the same, and in so doing these reasons were stated as inducements.

The above grave charges will be found in the following quotations:

"But if the lecturer had stated the views I have now quoted from S edenborg, it would have devolved upon him to show that he had contradicted himself. And as he has said nothing at all about this, I think this is pretty strong evidence that he had some doubt of there being any contradiction; and, therefore, *evidence* also of the *unfair spirit that actuated him in making his statement*, if not, of what is worse, a *disposition* to state that he *knew* to be *untrue*." Again; "he (the author of this lecture) seeks, *covertly* to fasten this charge upon them, whilst he *cowardly* keeps himself clear of the consequences of his SLANDER." Again: "This *slander* against the writings of Swedenborg, is therefore its own refutation." Again; "The *statement* of this lecturer is a *gross calumny and perversion* of his (Swedenborg's) teaching." Again "He (the author of this lecture) has *attempted to practice a fraud* on this community by publicly reiterating this charge. I hope he did it ignorantly—I should be loth to think he did it knowingly, and of intent to deceive. But if he did it in ignorance, he is *altogether inexcusable and culpable*; inasmuch as he who vouches for the truth of what he does not know to be true, is *guilty of falsehood, as well* as he who asserts that to be true, which he knows to be false.

Again: "If he, (the author of this lecture) had *been a christian*, nay if he had been MORALLY CANDID AND HONEST, he would have given

him (Swedenborg) the benefit of this redeeming quality. But this *did not* suit his purpose—he only wants to *give such a statement* as would ensure his condemnation by his audiance." Again : "The whole of this *statement* is *entirely untrue.* The *statement* that Swedenborg has written forty or fifty volumes on the Bible is a proof of the *disregard to literal accuracy* which DISTINGUISHES *the Rev. Lecturer.*" Again : "This *statement* is *unqualifiedly* FALSE." Again: "What then becomes of the positive assertion 'Swedenborg had just recovered from a fever, and was not in his right mind.' It is a *gratuitous slander* without any foundation whatever. The assertion that he had eaten too much, is also a *gratuitous supposition* and he who wilfully supposes evil of any one *cannot be called a christian.*" Again : "He (the author of this lecture") says he 'can respect our civil rights,' in reply to which I ask; why then don't you ? Any man who professes to respect another's civil rights, whilst at the same time *he is trying to blacken his character and to hold him up by false representations to ridicule and contempt, is assuming a virtue he does not possess,* and cannot expect that his professions will gain him either respect or credit with sensible men."

## SWEDENBORG'S CLAIM TO A DIVINE COMMISSION.

Swedenborg comes forward with a confident claim to *supernatural and infallible illumination.* He says a thousand times, and not unfrequently he repeats it in the same chapter, *that it was given him of the Lord* to see and know what he teaches. But the account of the manner in which his spiritual senses were opened: of his interviews with the Lord Jesus Christ; and of his commission to unfold the hidden sense of the word, to bring to view truths which were hidden in past ages, but are now revealed as essential to the true church, must be given in his own words. "I was in London, and one day dined rather late by myself, at a boarding house, where I kept a room, in which at pleasure I could prosecute the studies of the natural sciences. I was hungry *and ate with great appetite.* At the end of the meal, I remarked that a vapor, as it were, clouded my sight, and the walls of my chamber appeared covered with frightful creeping things, such as serpents, toads and the like. I was filled with astonishment but retained the full use of my perceptions and thoughts. The darkness attained to its height, and soon passed away. I then perceived a man sitting in the corner of my chamber. As I thought myself entirely alone I was greatly terrified, when he spoke and said, *'eat not so much.'* In the following night, the same man appeared to me again, and said, 'I am God the Lord, the Creator and Redeemer of the world. I have chosen thee to lay before men the spiritual sense of the holy word. I *will teach thee* what thou art to write. On that same night, were opened to my perception the heavens and the hells, where I saw many persons of my acquaintance, of all conditions. Daily the Lord opened the eyes of my spirit to see what was done in the other world, and gave

me, in a state of full wakefulness, to converse with angels and spirits*." Now, my hearers, what statement could be more unlikely than, that the Lord God should have seized an occasion such as this—an occasion of *gluttony*—of intemperate and censured indulgence, to bestow upon him the greatest honor—to open as he says, the eyes of his spirit, and "to endue" him, (in the language of Dr. Hartley, a distinguished Swedenborgian) "with heavenly gifts, BEYOND ANY OF THE PROPHETS *that preceded him*†?"

In his *Diary* the same event appears to be narrated. "In the middle of the day at dinner an angel spoke to me, and told me *not to eat too much at table*. Whilst he was with me, there plainly appeared to me a kind of vapor steaming from the pores of the body. It was a most visible watery vapor, and fell downwards to the ground upon the carpet, where it collected and turned into divers vermin, which were gathered together under the table, and in a moment went off with a POP." (p 397.)

From these accounts (given in his own words) of the manner in which he received his *divine commission*, is not the case of Swedenborg a *very clear* one, that his mind was disorded and unballanced; and that he was, to a drgree, *insane*. There can be no reasonable doubt of it.—Such was the opinion of Mr. Wesley. "I sat down," says he, "to read, and seriously to consider some of the writings of Baron Swedenborg.—I began with *huge prejudices in his favor*, knowing him to be a pious man, one of a strong understanding, and a most lively imagination. But he had a violent fever when he was about fifty-five years old *which quite overturned his understanding. Nor did he ever recover it, but it continued majestic, though in ruins.* From that time, he was exactly in the state of that man at Argos,

'Who wondrous tragedies was wont to hear,
Sitting alone in the empty theatre."

The same opinion—that he was a *mentally disordered man*—prevailed extensively among Swedenborg's cotemporaries.

*Hobart's Life p213—† Treaties on influx, Hartle's Edition, p 161.

## SWEDENBORGIANISM NOT CHRISTIANITY

Swedenborgians hold nothing in common with the different denominations of evangelical christians, except the existence and Unity of God; and as these points are held as much in common with Deists as Swedenborgians, they may be justly said to hold *nothing* in common with others which is peculiar to christianity. Were the difference between the two systems like that which prevails on the subject of baptism, or the possibility of falling from grace, the aspect of the case would be entirely changed, the fundamentals of christianity would be left untouched. But there is a *radical* difference in every feature. Swedenborgians have a different Bible, a different system of redemption, a different Christ, a different standard of piety, different rules of morality, a different resurrection, a different judgement, a different heaven, a different hell; in fine, a difference in respect to all the essential doctrines of christianity.

1. Swedenborgians have not the same *Bible* as christians. The christian's Bible consists of sixty-six canonical books. These, which compose the Old and New Testament, he believes to be THE WORD OF GOD; he regards the whole and every part of them, *as of divine authority*. The Swedenborgian's Bible consists of but about half this number of inspired books. The following are the rejected books of the Old Testament, namely: the two books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song; *about one sixth part of the Old Testament*. The new Testament is all rejected, with the exception of the four Gospels, and the Apocalypse. These portions of the Bible Swedenborgians reject, as being without inspiration or Divine authority: mere *human* productions. "They cannot for a moment," says Mr Hindmarsh, "be accounted equal to the other books, or be put in competition with them, for want of those *infinitely* superior prerogatives which must ever distinguish between a *divine* and a *human* production*." Mr. Hough says:

* Hindmarshe's Compendium p44.

"We *seek in vain* in the writings of the apostles for any satisfactory *explanation* of the *manner* in which the advent, death and resurrection of the Lord are made *available* for our redemption." "A similar remark might be made, in regard to the views of the apostles, on other subordinate doctrines, such for example as that of the *resurrection*." "The plain and necessary inference is that the apostles did *not* understand it." "That the apostles correctly understood the prophecies in regard to the coming of the Lord and the end of the world, will hardly be maintained by any one, who has observed the *discrepancies which exist in their writings*."

"But is it not a bold and daring presumption, to intimate that Emanuel Swedenborg has understood and explained the word of the Lord *better than the apostles*? I confess I am unable to see, why we are justly liable to such a charge provided we are convinced, on good and rational grounds, of the truth of what we assert. On the other hand, it seems to me that the presumption is on the part of those who deny the DIVINE ILLUMINATION OF OUR AUTHOR."

"But some reader may be disposed to stop and ask what does all this mean? Are not the writings of the apostles a part of the Word of the Lord? Certainly not. We have no evidence that they ought to be so regarded. Their writings, as well as their oral teachings were the *expressions of their own thoughts*— NOTHING MORE."*

So palpable is the evidence that Swedenborgians reject the books of Scripture, above named, as being the word of *man* not of *God—mere human productions.*

They not only thus utterly reject so great a part of what we verily believe to be the WORD OF GOD, but they contradict and deny, in numerous instances, and apparently without any scruple, the obvious teaching of the holy Scriptures. A few instances of contradiction are all that our limits will allow us to offer in proof of this assertion.

1. The Scriptures represent God as the creator of *all things.* He "created heaven and the things which therein are, and the earth and the things which therein are, and the sea and the things which are therein." "By him were *all things* created that are in heaven, and that are in earth." "The great and wide sea, wherein are things creeping innumerable, both small and great; behemoth, leviathan, dragons and all depths, beasts and all cattle, creeping things and flying fowl'—ALL are represented as the workmanship of his hand. But these obvious teachings of revelation, Swedenborg directly contradicts. According to him, a vast multitude of creatures and things, perhaps a majority—animals vegetables, and minerals, did not originate from God, but from *the hells.* "Such in the an-

* Hough's Judgment Day, p 74 70.

imal kingdom are poisonous serpents, scorpions, crocodiles, dragons, tigers, wolves, foxes, swine, owls, screech-owls, rats, mice, locusts, frogs, bats, spiders, flies, drones, moths, mites, in a word, all those which consume grasses, leaves, fruits, seeds, meat and drink, and are noxious to beasts and men. In the vegetable kingdom, they are all malignant, virulent and poisonous herbs, and pulse and shrubs of the same kind; also in the mineral kingdom all poisonous earths." 'Such things in the natural world *did not derive their origin from the Lord*; neither were they created from the beginning; neither did they originate from nature, by her sun; but THEY ARE FROM HELL.*"

2. The sacred writers assure us that the Lord hath made all things *for himself*;" and that "for *his pleasure* they are and were created." (Prov. 16 : 4. Rev. 4: 11.) But Swedenborg asserts, "the Lord did *not* create the universe for his own sake, but *for* the sake of those with whom he will dwell in heaven.†"

3. When our Lord "was in Jerusalem, at the passover, many *believed in his name*, when they saw *the miracles* that he did." When he had performed his first miracle, in Cana of Galilee, we are told, "his disciples *believed on him*." (John 2 : 11, 23. A miracle also was made the means of the conversion of St. Paul. But it was a maxim with Swedenborg, that "*no one is reformed by miracles and signs*, because they *force* men, and take away their free-agency in spiritual things‡." Were not the hearers of our Savior free-agents? Were *they* forced? Not forced to *embrace* him, certainly; for the most of them did not embrace him. not forced to *reject* him; for those who did reject him might have embraced him, if they would.

4. If words can teach anything, St. Paul taught the doctrine of *justification by faith*. "Being justified by faith we have peace with God. "A man is *not justified* by the works of the law, but *by the faith of Jesus Christ*." "We conclude that a man is *justified by faith*, without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3 : 28. 5 : 1. Gal. 2 : 16. But Mr. Clissold says, "*justification by faith* is *contrary* to the nature and constitution of things§."

"Let every one beware," says Swedenborg, "of this heresy, that *man is justified by faith without the works of the law*; for he who is in it, and does not fully recede from it before life ends, after death consociates with *infernal genii*‖."

5. In Luke 18 : 25, our Savior represents it as exceedingly difficult for a rich man to go to heaven. "It is easier for a camel to go through

*Angelic Wisdom concerning divine love, §§ 338, 339, 343. †Divine Providence, p 34.
‡ True Christian Religion, p 351. § Letters, &c., p 49. ‖ Apocalypse Revealed, p 556.

a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.', But Swedenborg says, "it has been given me to know of a certainty, that *the rich come as easily into heaven as the poor*;" and he goes on to represent the manner in which the rich live in heaven, "excelling all others in opulence, dwelling in palaces, and enjoying an abundance of all things expedient for the uses of life.*"

6. Again: Our Savior taught that in the resurrection, they neither marry or are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven."—But Mr. Hindmarsh unequivocally asserts that this again is a blunder, "that marriages *take place in heaven*, as well as upon earth†." And Swedenborg says that he himself was present at a wedding in heaven, and describes, with great particularity, the dresses of the bride and bridegroom, the cake and the wine, and all the ceremonies of the joyous occasion. "The *angel* conducted us to the house of the nuptials, and invited us into an ante-room of the marriage-chamber, where we saw in the middle a table, on which was placed a magnificent candlestick; on each side of the candlestick were two tables, on which were loaves in triple order, and tables also at the four corners of the room, on which were cups. Whilst we were examining these things, a door opened from an apartment next the marriage-chamber, and the bridegroom and bride came out, leading each other to a seat placed opposite to the candlestick, on which they placed themselves, the bridegroom on the left hand, and the bride on his right. The bridegroom was clad in a robe of luxurious purple, and a tunic of fine shining linen, with an ephod, upon which was a golden plate set round with diamonds, and on the plate was engraven a young eagle, the marriage ensign; but the bride was clad in a crimson robe, and beneath it a garment of fine needle-work reaching from her neck to her feet. When they were thus seated, the bridegroom turned himself to the bride, and placed upon her finger a golden ring, and drew forth armlets and a collar of pearls, and tied the armlets about her arms, and the collar around her neck, and said, *accept these pledges*; and as she accepted them, he kissed her, and said, Now thou art mine; and he called her his wife. When this was done, all the guests exclaimed, A blessing be upon you! And then the servants in waiting took loaves from the two tables near the candlestick, and cups, now filled with wine, from the tables at the corner of the room and gave to each of the guests his loaf and his cup, and they ate and drank. After these things the husband and his wife rose up, entered the bed-chamber; and the door was shut‡."

*Heaven and Hell, p195. †Hindmarshe's Letter, p337. ‡Conj, Love, p27, 28.

7. St John describes the inhabitants of heaven—the four living creatures, the four-and-twenty elders, and the countless multitude of angels, as all engaged in celebrating the praises of Jehovah and the Lord. "*They rest not day and night*, saying, holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was and is, and is to come." But this Swedenborg insists is another gross mistake. "To praise and celebrate God is *not* the life required, neither has God need of praise and celebrations*." He then tells us of a class of spirits who came into heaven under the impression that their business and joy there would be to praise and worship God. And to convince them of their error, they were confined to these employments for three successive days. But on the second day, the most of them were found asleep, "and those that were awake were *yawning and yawning*, and all felt a compression of the heart, and a weariness of spirit from fatigue." Nor could the assembly be kept together to the end of the third day. It broke up in a *row*;—"They rose up, and ran in a body to the gates, *broke them open, and rushed upon the guards and drove them away*†."

8. The *christian's heaven* is a place of unspotted purity. "There shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatever weareth abomination or maketh a lie." (Rev. 21 : 27.) But the Swedenborgian's heavens are not of this character. The wicked are often admitted into them by way of experiment. "They who are in evils and falsess may, indeed, by permission, *ascend into heaven* ; but when they enter, they begin to draw their breath or to respire with difficulty and presently their sight is obscured, their understanding is darkened, and thought ceases,and death seems present before their eyes,and thus they stand like a stock ; and then they begin to have a beating at the heart, and a straightness over the heart,the mind is seized with anguish, and they become more and more tormented, and in that state writhe themselves about, like a serpent laid before the fire; therefore they roll themselves away and cast themselves headlong down a precipice ; nor do they rest till they are in hell among their like, where they can respire, and their hearts vibrate freely‡."

On one occasion, Swedenborg says some of the visitors in one of the heavens became so unchaste and wanton in their desires,that the ladies of the place avoided them. "After this the conducting angel went to the six virgins, and gave them an account of his companions, and requested, that they would honor them with their company ; and they approached ; but when they were near,they (the virgins) suddenly retired

*Heaven and Hell, p224. †True Christian Religion, p492-3. ‡Apoc. Revealed. p384.

and entered the women's apartment, where were also the virgins their companions : on seeing this, the conducting angel followed them, and asked why they retired so suddenly without speaking with them ?—

They replied, we could not approach. And he said why is this ?— And they answered, we perceived something which repelled and drove us back again : we hope they will excuse us. And the angel returned to his companions, and told them what the virgins had said, and added, I infer that your love of the sex is not chaste. At this his companions smiled, and said, you conjecture rightly, who can behold such beauties near, and*"&c. (The vulgarity of the remainder of the sensence forbids our giving it.

And this is the Swedenborgian's heaven ! How infinitely different from the christians !

9. Again : the christians heaven is not only a place of perfect holiness, but of *unmingled happiness.* "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes ; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain for the former things have passed away." (Rev. 21 : 4.) But the Swedenborgian's heavens are as far from unmingled happiness, as they are from perfect holiness.— "The lot of those," says Swedenborg, "in whom the spiritual degree is not opened, and still not shut," (a very peculiar condition indeed)"after death is, forasmuch as they are still natural and not spiritual,they are in the lowest parts of *heaven* where they sometimes experience *severe suffering*†."

10. Swedenborg teaches that, "In no true doctrine of the Lord is there found anything of vengeance, nor is ought else found there *but love*‡." But how is this to be reconciled with the teachings of the Apostles ? "Taking *vengeance* on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." "Who are set forth for an example, suffering the *vengeance of eternal fire.*" (2d Thess. 1: 8. Jude. 7.)

11. Again Swedenborgians teach that "*no one* suffers punishment in hell on account of the evils which he had done *in the world*, but on account of the evils which he *then* does§." But the inspired Apostles of our Lord taught, that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done *in his body*, according to that he *hath done*, whether it be good or evil." (3d Cor. 5:9.

Indeed Mr. Hindmarsh, a distinguished, authorized representative of Swedenborgianism, from whose works we have already quoted, insists

*Conj. Love, p29. †Div. Love and Wisdom, p121. ‡Parsons Esays, p204. §Heaven and Hell, p295

that *many parts* of the scriptures are to be understood in a sense *diametrically opposite* to the expression of the letter ; as where it is said that God is *angry*, that he *punishes, casts into hell and destroys* ; the true sense of which is, that God is *loving and merciful to all; hating none, punishing none, casting none into hell*,"* &c.

You are now, my hearers, able to form an intelligent opinion, in regard to the manner in which Swedenborg and his disciples treat the word of God. They reject nearly one half of the Bible, as being without inspiration; or Divine authority, and frequently; and without scruple give utterance to sentiments, which are, as we have shown, in direct and palpable contradiction to its obvious teachings.

2. Swedenborgians have not the same *Christ* as christians. The christian's Christ was not only *God* but *man*—man in the *absolute sense*. Man is a complex being, consisting of body and soul ; both which were alike necessary to constitute the humanity of Christ. But the Swedenborgian's Christ had *no human soul* and, of course; was not properly a human being. "There was this difference," says Mr. Noble, "between the Lord Jesus Christ, while in a body of flesh on earth, and *all* ordinary men ; whereas they take their soul, from a human father, Jesus Christ, having no father but the Divine Father, had his soul from the Divine essence ; and as the Divine essence is incapable of division, *the Divine essence itself, or the Divine Father, was in fact his soul* ; while *his body*, was *all* that he took from his mother. Again ; "whilst the human form which the Lord assumed by birth of the virgin, neccessarily partook, at first, of her infirmities, *its soul was no other than the invisible Jehovah†."*

It devolves on those who take this view of the case, to show how the child Jesus not only increased in stature, "but in wisdom ;" which in our judgment; he could not have done had not his intellectual nature been human ; for the Divine Mind, or "the Divine Father," knows no advancement.

3. Although Swedenborgians represent Christ as having no human soul, yet, marvellous to tell, they represent him as *having been subject*, while here on earth, to many *evil loves and false persuasions*, to great *moral-impurities and imperfections.* In the spiritual sense of Swedenborg, the literal David of the Old Testament was *the Christ* ; and accordingly he represents David's confession of sin, in the 32d Psalm,and his prayer to be purified from sin in the fifty-first Psalm, as the *Lord's confession and prayer‡*. Mr. Noble speaks of the "infirmities" and "*imperfections*" which our Lord "inherited from his mother§."

*Letters to Priestly, p339. †Noble's Appeal, p398-454. ‡Summary Exposition,p75-79. §Appeal,p455.

Mr Barrett says that Christ assumed "humanity with all its *evil loves and false persuasions.*" Following Christ "must mean, that we are to fight against and remove the evils and falses appertaining to our natural man, as he fought against and removed *the evils and falses which appertained* to his *natural and assumed humanity.*" Again, "the steps by which the Lord glorified his human were a series of temptation, combats, or a constant warfare against those INFERNAL PRINCIPLES, of which his humanity was FULL." "The Lord says concerning his disciples, 'and for their sakes I sanctify myself.' These words clearly show that there was something in the Lord, when on earth, which needsanctifying—something which *was not yet pure and holy.* Hence, they must have been said in reference, not to his Divine, but to his assumed human nature ; for *this,* like the human nature of other men, was by inheritance FULL of *impure and unhallowed principles**." HORRID BLASPHEMY ! ! That immaculate personage, who is declared by the Apostles to have been "holy, harmless, undefiled"—"without blemish, and without spot," is here represented as under the influence of "*evil loves and false persuasions*"—as "*not yet pure and holy*"—as FULL OF IMPURE, UNHALLOWED, and even of INFERNAL PRINCIPLES ! !"

4. The *method of salvation,* as exhibited in the theological writings of Swedenborg and his disciples, is entirely different from that of the Christians. They utterly reject the *atonement* of Christ, as consisting in his vicarious sufferings and death. "The work of redemption," says Mr. Hindmarsh, "did *not* consist in the Lord's offering himself as a sacrifice in the room of mankind.' Swedenborg says, "the first act of redemption was the subjugation of the hells. The second act of redemption was the separation of the evil from the good, the casting of the evil into hell and the raising of the good to heaven. Afterwards followed the reduction of all order in hell and of all order in heaven ; also instructions concerning truths which will be of faith, and in goods which will be of charity, and thus the establishment of a new church." Again ; the Lord came into the world, to reduce to order all things in heaven and in earth ; and this was effected by spiritual combats against the hells, which at that time infected every man on his entrance into this world and departure out of it†." Mr. Clissold says, "since the atonement wrought by Jesus Christ was no other than the reconciliation of the human nature to the Divine, so this reconciliation was

*Barrett's Lectures, p220, 240, 241, 266. †General Summary, p29-33. Doctrine of the Lord, p24.

a progressive work, which was finally completed by the passion of the cross. Jesus Christ is our great archetype, our *examplar* which we are to follow. We are, therefore, called upon to work in ourselves, in *our* human nature, the same kind of work which he wrought in *his*; he after an infinite manner, we after a finite*."

Mr. Barrett says; "Christ come into the natural world in a bodily form; clothed himself with the natural humanity—defiled, borne down and oppressed with evils of all kinds, as that humanity was; and by degrees purified it from all its defilements, and filled every region of it with his divinity. Thus he glorified that humanity, or *made it divine.* He came as *the Word—as truth divine*, or the Son; and by a series of temptation combats, he successively united that truth with love divine, the Father, in the assumed humanity; that so he might, thenceforward be able to unite truth in the understanding with love in the will, in the minds of all men who will permit him to do so; and in this way gradually lead men back to their original happy state of conjunction with the word, which is heavenly and eternal life†."

I have now given you the doctrine of Swedenborgian redemption in the words of its own teachers. And what, I ask, does this theory of *the atonement of redemption* amount to? What has Christ *actually done* for his people? He has afforded them *instruction.* He has set them an example. He overcame *his* temptations, and they must overcome *theirs.*—He has also removed and restrained to some extent the evil spirits, or hells, so that the temptations of men may not be so great, nor their return to God so difficult, as they would otherwise have been But has he made any satisfaction to the broken law, or the injured justice of Jehovah? Has he opened to the despairing sinner a way of pardon? not at all. Nothing of this was needed. The atonement of Swedenborgians therefore, when stripped of all its magniloquent, mystical and absurd phraseology, is little more than atonement of the *simple humanitarian*—a *provision*, on the ground of which some of the difficulties in the way of repentance are removed, and new motives are furnished for the performance of the duty. It is entirely different, therefore, from that of the Scriptures, as these are understood by evangelical christians.

6. Swedenborgians not only reject the atonement, but the *intercession* of Christ. Mr. Noble says, "it was only while the work of glorification was in progress, that Jesus prayed to the Father, or gave him

*Letters, &c;, p47. †Lectures, p225.

thanks."§ And Mr. Clissold asks, "what becomes of the phraseology with which prayers in general, are opened and terminated. What becomes of our addresses to the Father beseeching him to listen to the prayers of his son, Jesus Christ, and to receive us for his sake? What becomes of the popular notions of Christ, as an *Advocate*, pleading his merits to the Father, and interceding with him, for the sake of these merits, to send the Holy Spirit* ?" Yes, and I may ask, what on this ground, becomes of *all christian supplication*—such as in the Scriptures we are directed to offer ?" Whatsoever ye shall ask *the Father in my name*, he will give it you." (John 16 : 23.) "If any man sin, we have an *Advocate* with the Father." (1 John 2 : 1.) "Through *him* (Christ) we have access by one *Spirit* unto the *Father*." (Eph. 2: 18.)

6. Swedenborgians reject the doctrine of *justification by faith*. This doctrine—justification by faith alone in the righteousness of Jesus Christ —is regarded by all evangelical denominations—Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists—as fundamental to the christian system. It is indeed the great *master-truth* of the gospel—the glory of the church of Christ, around which its brightest hopes rally, and on which the super-structure of its happiness must be built.—By this doctrine the apostles and primitive christian teachers first subdued the nations to the obedience of the faith. By the revival of this doctrine in its original purity, the reformation from Popery was effected. And it is only as this doctrine is preached in its Scriptural simplicity, and with holy zeal, inspired by a personal experience of its truth, that sinners are to be converted from the error of their ways, and saints established in the liberty with which Christ has made them free.

This glorious doctrine—vitally important in the christian system—Swedenborg and his disciples impugn and reject. "The popular doctrine of justification by faith," says Mr. Clissold, "is one which we consider to be contrary to God's word, and contrary to the real nature and constitution of things†." Mr. Parsons calls it "the dreadful doctrine of salvation by faith alone," which "the Reformers placed in the center of their religion. It stood there with all its deformity undisguised, all its power to wound and slay unmitigated. It stood there as the abomination of desolation, in the very sanctuary of the temple‡." Swedenborg unqualifiedly asserts that all who die in the belief of the doctrine of justification by faith are inevitably *damned*. "Let every one* beware," he says, "of this heresy, that *man is justified by faith without the*

§Appeal, p402. *Letters, p42-43. †Letters, &c., p 49. ‡Essays, p134.

*works of the law* ; for he who is in it, and does not fully recede from it before life ends, after death consociates with *infernal genii*; for they are the goats, concerning whom the Lord says, 'Depart from me,ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels*." He denominates the clergy who preach this doctrine—Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Baptist, Congregational—he denominates them *all* "Abaddons and Appollyons"—"angels of the abyss." They "are also Leviathans, crooked Leviathans and oblong Leviathans, whom God will visit with his hard and great sword†."

7. The *future resurrection of the body* is another of the great doctrines of revelation,which Swedenborg and his disciples unitedly reject. They maintain that man, as to his spirit, is raised commonly, on "*the third day* after the heart ceases to beat, and that the body returns to dust, to live no more. "The external (the body,") says Mr. Hindmarsh, "is rejected at death, and being no longer needful, is never re-assumed‡."

8. The Scriptures assure us that there is to be a *general judgment*, to be accomplished in person by the Lord Jesus Christ. But this solemn doctrine of revelation Swedenborg and his disciples deny. The last judgment Swedenborg says has already taken place. "It was granted me," he says, "to see these things with my own eyes, in order that I might be able to testify of them. The last judgment was commenced in the begining of the year 1757, and was fully accomplished at the end of that year§."

9. Swedenborgians have not the same *standard of piety* as christians. "It is not so difficult," Swedenborg says, "as it is supposed, to live a life which leads to heaven." In discussing this proposition he goes on to say : "Some people believe that a spiritual life is difficult, since they have been told that a man must renounce the world, and deprive himself of the concupiscences of the body and the flesh ; which things they conceive as implying, that they must spend their days in prayer, and in reading the word and other pious books. But that the case is *altogether different* has been given me to *know*, from much experience and from conversation with the angels. Indeed, they who renounce the world and live in the Spirit, in the manner above described, procure to themselves a *sorrowful life*, which is *not recepticle of heavenly joy*." With Swedenborgians, then, a life of pious reading, meditation, and devotion, so far from contributing to genuine spirituality, is inconsistent with it. A life so conducted, "is not recepticle of heavenly joy." But men must "live in the world," and not renounce it, and enjoy "the concupiscences of

*Apoc. Revealed, p556. †True Christian Religion, p153. ‡Compendium, p49. §Last Judgment, p40.

the body and the flesh*." In his work on charity, Swedenborg recommends the following "delights and pleasures of the bodily senses:"—"Convivialities, feasts, entertainments and all kinds of merry-making, games which are played at home with dice, billiards, and cards; and dances at wedding parties, and festive meetings†." These things are *recommended* on the *highest authority*, even that of an inspired and heaven-taught teacher. Indeed, Swedenborg represents them, or some of them, as practiced *in heaven*. On the 24th page of Conj. Love, he speaks of ten men who were invited into one of the heavens "to see its joys" and learn the nature of "eternal happiness." And here they were told of the festivities of the place: such as "concerts of music, *games, shows and dramatic entertainments.*" There were also exhibited the "various sports of young men and boys, such as *running, handball, and rockets* &c." Ennobling employment, surely, for young men and boys in heaven! This my hearers, is the *New Church!* the institution which professes to *supersede the gospel dispensation*, as distinct from it, and superior to it, as that is superior to the Jewish! *The New* Church! From it, good Lord deliver us.

10. The *rules of morality* exhibited in Swedenborgian divinity, are different from those of the christian. Swedenborg taught that, "polygamy is not sin with those whose religion sanctions or permits it.‡"—Consequently, he goes on to say, it was no sin among the Isralites of old; nor is it sin among the Mahomedans and Mormons of the present day. For the Mahomedans, he says, there are two heavens "the lower and the higher." In the *lower heaven "they live with many wives and concubines, as in the world*; but those who renounce concubines, and live with one wife, are elevated into the higher heaven§." Swedenborg visited the polygamist in heaven, sat down with him "in the vestibule" of his harem, and entered into conversation with him respecting marriages. "We do not live with one wife," said the celestial, "but some with two, and three, and some with more; because variety, obedience, and honor delight us; and these we have from our wives, if they are many. With one wife, there would be no pleasure from variety, but disgust and sameness; nor would there be flattering courteousness from obedience, but disquietude from equality; nor would there be satisfaction and honor from dominion, but vexatious disputes concerning superiority. And *what is a woman*? Is she not born *subject to the will of man—to serve, not to rule*? Wherefore here, every husband in his own house, has, as it were, royal majesty. And because this is our love

*Heaven and Hell, p 309. †p39. ‡Conj. Love, p284, §Conj. Love, p284.

it is also the *blessedness of our life.*" Swedenborg professes to have expostulated with the angel ; (for the man here speaking, it must be remembered, is an inhabitant of heaven)but he could make no impression. "What else makes a man blessed," rejoined the angel, "but the emulation of wives, contending for the honor of the husbands highest favor*?' Strange source of blessedness in heaven !!

Swedenborg taught, "that it is not lawful for a *christian* to marry but one wife." Nor may a christian be *formally, legally divorced* from his wife, except for a single cause—that assigned by our Savior in St. Mathew, 19 : 9. But there are *many* causes he says—causes *"legitimate, just, real and sufficient,"* for taking a concubine into the wife's bed, provided the wife is not cohabited with at the same time "This concubinage," he says, " is *not repugnant* to conjugal love."

Concerning concubinage in general, Swedenborg lays down twelve distinct propositions, which he discusses through half a score of pages. The following are two of them : "That concubinage, *conjointly with a wife*, is altogether unlawful to christians. That concubinage *apart from the wife*, when it is engaged in from *legitimate, just, and truly sufficient causes, is not unlawful.*" The sufficient causes of separation and concubinage, he said, are two-fold ; those relating, first, to the mind and secondly, to the body. Among the *mental* infirmities which are sufficient to justify the taking of a concubine, he mentions the following : "Mania, frenzy, raving, actual foolishness, loss of memory, severe hysteric disease, extreme symplicity so that there is no perception of *good and truth*" (in the Swedenborgian sense, I suppose,) "the highest stubbornness in not obeying what is just and equal ; pleasure in prating and talking upon nothing but insignificant things and trifles ; eagerness for publishing the secrets of the house ; also for wrangling, striking, revenging, doing mischief, lying, cheating ; neglect of infants, luxury, too great prodigality, uncleanness, impiety, dissimilitude, and other like things. That these are *just* causes of concubinage, because they are just causes of separation," he says, *"reason sees without a judge."* They are to be "ADJUDGED" he says "BY THE MAN ALONE."

Among the bodily infirmities which justify concubinage, the following are distinctly mentioned : "Malignant and pestilential fevers, Leprosies, phthisic, cancers ; warts ; foul, corrupt (or bad) breath ; lipothamia, which is languidness of body and defect of strength ; palsey ;—certain chronic diseases , permanent infirmity from apoplexies ; hernia, epilepsey, and other like diseases.†"

*Conj. Love, p75-76. †Conj. Love, p363, 368, 369, 206, 207.

Here are between thirty and forty causes or reasons for separation and concubinage, distinctly assigned, *either of which* Swedenborg says is just and sufficient; he speaks of *more like causes*; but how many more we are not informed. The husband too is to decide for himself, whether any of these causes actually exist. "That these are just causes of *separation and concubinage, reason sees without a judge*;" i. e., without their being submitted to any legal tribunal for adjudication. They are to be "*adjudged by the man alone*," or as his own translator explains it "they *are to be decided by the man himself*."

I have no disposition to comment on this statement which I have extracted from the acknowledged works of Swedenborg. It speaks for itself. This is the *New Church!* declared to be "the crown of all churches!" From it, good Lord deliver us.

Again; Swedenborg taught that, "*Fornication is light*, so far as it looks to conjugial love, and prefers it." "Care is to be taken," he says "lest CONJUGIAL LOVE, by *immoderate and inordinate fornication*, should be destroyed." But he teaches that "*moderate and ordinate* fornications do *not* destroy conjugal love." Then he further teaches that, "COJUGIAL LOVE—with those who for various causes cannot as yet enter into marriage, and on account of salacity *cannot govern their lusts* —MAY BE PRESERVED, if *the love of the sex be restricted to* ONE MISTRESS." This proposition he thus explains and discusses: "That by those who are salacious, immoderate and inordinate lust *cannot be restrained, reason sees and experience teaches.* In order therefore, that this immoderateness and inordinateness" (which alone destroys conjugial love)—"with those who who cannot, for many causes, precipitate marriage—may be curbed and reduced to something moderate and ordinate" (which does *not destroy* conjugial love) "there appears no other refuge and as it were *asylum*, than THE KEEPING OF A MISTRESS*."—Swedenborg then goes on to assign no less than *six* distinct reasons why under the circumstances specified, *a mistress should be kept.* He enforces this *expedient, for preserving conjugial love from becoming scortatory love* especially upon young men. And he leaves every young man to judge whether the circumstances do, or do not, exist in his own case.

These statements, which I have fairly extracted from the writings of Swedenborg, like those before given, need no comment. I leave them my hearers to your own consideration.

Swedenborgians, thererore, hold nothing in common, with others which is peculiar to christianity. The system which they embrace, when compared with the system embraced by other evangelical christians, is

* Conj. Love, p353, 356, 357, 358,

seen, at once, to be, entirely another thing—a perfect *antagonism* to the whole system of evangelical christianity. It is therefore, perfectly plain that but one of these systems can be christianity. If the system of religious belief embraced by Swedenborgians be christianity, the system embraced bythe great body of the church in every age, cannot be christianity ; and, if, on the other hand, it be admitted, as we think it certainly must, that the system of religious belief embraced by the great body of the church of Jesus Christ in every age, be christianity, the religious system of Swedenborgians can no more be christianity, than intemperance can be temperance ; because they are so entirely different, that in all their leading features, they are as I have shown, essentially antagonistic to each other. Now, I inquire, what is that system which is just the opposite of christianity ; or, which is, as absolutely opposed to christianity, as light is to darkness, or as truth is to falsehood ? It is obviously anti-christianity, or INFIDELITY : and *can be nothing else.*—

But it is inquired, have you not misrepresented the opinions of Swedenborgians in the quotations you have made ? I am not concious of having done it, in the least degree. And let it be remembered that these quotations are made, either from the writings of Swedenborg himself, or those of the most distinguished ministers, and well-accredited authors in the denomination—the writings of men who are the authorized teachers and representatives of Swedenborgianism, and for which the whole denomination is responsible, inasmuch as the whole denomination sustains them as teachers. We might have extended our quotations on all the various points named, but the specimens given were deemed sufficient. If Swedenborgians have been misrepresented in this lecture, they are not misrepresented by me, but by their own *prophet* and authorized teachers ; for *they are the authors* of the representation of their faith, which I have given and *not me.* I have done precisely as I would be done by. If any one will take as much pains, and give as full and fair a view of the church of which I have the honor of being a minister and a member, from the works of her standard authors, and authorized formularies and Articles, as I have of Swedenborgianism, I will certainly be very much obliged to them.

# DEFENCE

## OF REV. A. O. BRICKMAN, BEFORE THE LUTHERAN CONFERENCE,

ON THE CHARGE OF HAVING

## EMBRACED THE DOCTRINES OF SWEDENBORG.

---

"For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."—2 Cor. xiii. 8.
"Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech."—2 Cor. iii. 12.

I stand before you, charged with various sins of heretical nature, which I shall have committed against the Lutheran Church, contrary to my ordination vows. I therefore have appeared before you on the necessity of an honorable defence. The charges preferred against me are the following:

1st. He has adopted the tenets of Swedenborgianism, or, as it is otherwise known, of the "New Church," and preaches them publicly to his congregation.

2d. He makes use of the Swedenborgian Liturgy, and has introduced their publications into his Sunday School and congregation.

3d. Several communications from him have appeared in the New Church Repository, edited by Prof. Bush, of New-York, in the September and November numbers, in which he avows himself already in heart a member of the New Church, and asks only for time, before he shall seek an open and formal connection. In one of his letters he speaks slightingly of the old views of the atonement, and gives abundant evidence in both, that he has departed from the Faith of the Lutheran Church.

4th. He has expressed his unbelief in the credibility of certain portions of the writings of Moses and Paul.

These are the charges, precisely in the same form and manner as they are drawn up by my accuser, the Rev. W. F. Eyster, Pastor of the English Lutheran Church in Chambersburg. They were sent to me on the 28th of January, 1854, by the President of the West Pennsylvania Synod. I was challenged to appear before you on this 8th day of February, 1854. Here I have met you, brethren, and here you have handed me a new list of charges a few hours ago. These charges read as follows:

I [*F. W. Eyster*] charge the Rev. Arthur O. Brickman with a rejection of the doctrines of the Word of God, as taught in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession.

SPECIFICATIONS.

I.

1. He has *affirmed* his *full belief in all the* theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, which writings reject some of the fundamental *truths* of the *Word of God*, as taught in the Augsburg Confession, and as held by Protestants generally; such as

the *doctrines of the Trinity in a proper sense*, the *proper* and *eternal* Divinity of Christ, the *vicarious* sacrifice of Christ, justification by grace through faith in the *atoning sacrifice*.

2. He has expressly denied the doctrine of a *Trinity of persons* in the one God, as taught in the first Article of the Augsburg Confession.

3. He has expressly denied the *vicarious design* of the *sufferings* and *death* of the Lord Jesus Christ, as taught in the third Article of the Augsburg Confession.

4. He has expressly denied the doctrine of justification gratuitously for Christ's sake through faith, as taught in the fourth and twentieth Articles of the Augsburg Confession.

II.

I charge the Rev. Mr. Brickman with the denial of the credibleness and divine authority of that portion of the writings of the Apostle Paul, which teaches the resurrection of the *human material* body*.

III.

I charge Rev. Mr. Brickman with circulating fundamental error, by preaching the doctrines of Swedenborgianism, by introducing into his congregation a Liturgy, Sunday-school books and other publications, containing the tenets of that heterodox system.

The first charge has reference to my theological views in general, and has therefore reference to my embracing the doctrines and disclosures of *the Lord's servant*, EMANUEL SWEDENBORG. This charge I do now, and will always, regard as one of great honor to me. Yes! I do, as already publicly stated in the Lutheran Observer, "truly believe in those theological views" to which you refer. I accept them with the perfect assurance, that they are God's truth, and the doctrines of the heavenly Jerusalem, as revealed from heaven. And believe me, my brethren, that, whilst it gladdens my soul to confess this publicly before you, I sincerely wish you were all in the same blessed conviction.

I know I stand before you not like a Paul before King Agrippa. You are endowed with less power than that *almost* persuaded potentate, and I have less to fear from you than Paul had from Agrippa. But I assure you, if you all were Agrippas, Pontius Pilates, or even Neros, you would still, as in this hour, so on every other occasion like this, see that same happy face before you, and hear the same bold confession which now, with a cheerful heart, I avow.

What now I confess, I confess *cheerfully*. Would fear of man, or worldly interest, have governed my heart, I would not stand before you. I would have kept my convictions to myself; and I would never have been molested about them by any body. But that will never do for an upright and truly honest man. The Lord Jesus must be confessed before men; and woe unto me, if I would here say anything contradictory to my heart's inmost assurance. I believe in the doctrines of the heavenly Jerusalem; and to deny it, would be nothing less than a denial of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is not without deep reason that I have arrived to my present conviction. The universal corruption of Christian doctrines, the negative more and more itself dissolving Protestantism into infidelity and exclusive Sectarianism,

* Mr. Eyster afterwards struck the word "material" out.

which, for most selfish purposes, torture God's holy word; the continually raging war between Philosophy and Theology, and many other significant signs of the present time; rouse candid and pious men everywhere to a sense of duty. And amongst them it is one universal question: "*Where is the fault?*" The greatest historians and the profoundest philosophers of the present age, unite in acknowledging that God's providence is preparing a new and most remarkable era. Intelligent Christians who, with more than mere *common sense spirit*, observe and watch the signs of the present time, wait anxiously for the things to come. And what does the future bear in its bosom? Puseyism and kindred systems hope for a re-union of all denominations. They flatter themselves, and, indeed, not altogether in vain, with that beautiful and much truth-containing idea, that the era before us, is the Johannic age, or the age of Love and Truth.

Protestantism and Catholicism will re-unite, and then there will be one flock and one shepherd. In this manner do the most of our pious historians and philosophers try to solve the problem of the church question, which at present agitates the whole Christian world. And happy is the man who becomes a co-worker in this glorious work! Happy is the man who can aid in dissipating those obscurities which trouble the mind of so many candid men. And I, my dear brethren, claim nothing less than to be in a meek and polite manner, and according to my humble capacities, a helpmate in this great work.

Deeper investigation of the church question has, however, convinced me, that at the bottom of the historical question lies that of the dogmatical. If such a union shall be effected—if a "New Church" shall be established—it can not possibly be done without a *platform*, which gives *universal* satisfaction to Protestantism and Catholicism. It must be a platform which really reconciles Philosophy and Theology. But where shall this platform come from? Can you find among the sects or creeds one which will satisfy all? Look about! There is dark, gloomy Catholicism on the one side, split into two great parties. The one stands under the authority of the Pope, the other under the Czar. Will one of their systems satisfy the Christian world? On the other side is Protestantism, torn into fragments by the rough and hatred-bearing hand of sectarianism. Each sect has its own Pope of paper in its symbols, with the three-fold crown of a three-personal Deity on the head. And woe unto the man who would stretch forth his hand to tear it off. His holiness, the creed, is surrounded by a priesthood who, with a thousand mental reservations on the explanation of the same, are always ready to defend the idol. Will any of these sects, or their symbols, satisfy the world and bring about the age of Love and Truth? Never! Never! They are immersed in falsities and errors. This glorious mission can never be fulfilled by any of them. If the Lord Jesus Christ himself would come and appear personally among them, I tell you, He would nowhere be accepted as an *orthodox man:* far less would they permit Him to preach in their "*meeting-houses.*" Suppose he came, in full divine power as the God-man, to drive from his temple the oxen and pigeon-sellers. Suppose he appeared at Rome, telling the degraded Catholics, "Your

mass is wrong; your prayers to the Virgin Mary and the Saints, and your many pictures, rosaries, peregrinations, and other things place you in the category of idolators. You are a deluded race of people. Your priests are blind servants of Baal; you are totally corrupted." Do you suppose they would receive him, and make him their real Pope? Do you really believe Pio the IXth would, as his vicar, resign his office into the hands of his master? They would give him, for a few days, a place in the Vatican, in one department of which you can see the implements of torture of the holy Inquisition; and there they would torture and kill him as a heretic, for the best good of the church. In the United States of North America, the sons of Erin would brickbat, and persecute, and kill him. But suppose he would appear in any other country of the old world. In Russia, the Czar would surely send him to Siberia; and in Prussia, the metropolis of Protestantism, he would not dare to preach against the Roman Catholic errors. What did the King of Prussia do, not long ago, with our Lutheran brother, the Rev. Mr. Heinrich, of Langerfeld, when, as a true Protestant, he preached in his pulpit against the Roman Catholic errors, which the Jesuits, on their tour through Germany, promulgated? What did the king do, when this our brother, as a conscientious Lutheran, defended the faith of his forefathers against the slanderous assaults of the Jesuits? He was sentenced to the penitentiary. If the Lord was to appear in Prussia, the government would, at least, send him for life-time to Spandau, or, more likely, they would array him before a court-martial and shoot him. But in the old country he could neither appear among Protestants nor Catholics. In Germany, Austria, Russia, France, Bavaria, Italy, or any other country where no liberty of press and speech exists, he could even not obtain a permission to preach. But suppose he would do it, what would be the consequence? if even he would satisfy his tempting adversaries by answers like—"Render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." The most learned D.D.'s and Professors of Theology, these High Priests and Scribes of Germany, who form the critics of theology, have criticised almost every book, chapter, and verse out of the Bible. *These, our Lutheran critical brethren* in Europe*, would they receive the Lord? Rudolph Steir says of them: "The present mad critics of the gospels, these ravers of infidelity, cannot hear any more, on account of their roaring paroxysm of infidelity." Suppose he would tell these men, in the true sense of orthodoxcism, I am the second person of the blessed Trinity! O how they would laugh, and ridicule him! I should not wonder if they would think him *beside himself* [Mark iii. 21], and propose to send him to an asylum. And what would our orthodox party say, if he would say to them, This or that doctrine is wrong; give it up. Such doctrines are anti-scriptural and anti-reasonable. If you do not give them up, infidelity will triumph over you, because science justly annihilates your

* "Die neueste, tollgewordene Kritik der Evangelien, diese Raserei des unglaubens hoert vollends nicht mehr vor dem Brausen ihrer Fieber-Phantasieen."—*R. Stier. Reden Jesu IX. in der Vorrede zum Matth. Thl I., II., Auflage*, 1851.

very premises in your dogmatics? They would readily say, "He holds it with the mad critics of the time, who propose to send him to an asylum. He shall not betray us over to them; rather let us join those critics and carry their proposal into execution. Let us get rid of him as soon as possible."

But suppose he would appear in Protestant England. Suppose an angel would appear in the clouds, and announce to the people, The Lord is coming! Granted that they would receive him, if he came down in the fiery wagon of Elijah. But it is still very questionable whether they might not think him to be that *Person* spoken of in the Bible, who can make the fire fall down from heaven. I will not hesitate to believe, that Queen Victoria would have him carried in triumph to St. Paul's Church. But if Christ would speak against the common prayer-book and its errors, I do not hesitate either to believe that they would carry him out again. But, say you, the people would protest and say, Did we not hear the voice of an angel above our land? Yes! But that D.D. yonder would readily have a scientific answer, such as, a flying hallucination, to be explained according to the science of *mesmerism*. And then would follow the many historical datas of Mohamed, Joe Smith, and, in the same category, as a matter of course, the father of *that strangest and most puerile of all deviation from the plain, unsophisticated import of God's revealed truth*—Emanuel Swedenborg!

But, say you, the Presbyterians would give him a hearty welcome. Would they? Indeed. Only as long as they did not suspect him to differ from John Calvin. As soon as he would say, "When first I made my advent, I lived and died for all. Your doctrine of predestination is as wrong and as wilfully a falsification of my word as your conception of the atonement is, in accordance with other sects, a God-disgracing fabrication of your carnal hearts," they would immediately say, "Stop this babbler! He appeared among us as an angel of light, but he is really the lying Lucifer." But, say you, if he would do wonders, they would soon think different. Now, suppose he would do wonders, and cry forth, "If you will not believe my words, believe my wonders." I tell you wonders would never convince them. The question would always be: By whose authority and power does he do them? Here the answer would be: "We see the wonders and believe them, but we know that thou art enabled, by superior power, to make the fire fall down from heaven. Thy wonders testify against thee." All reasonable demonstrations would here be in vain. Lutherans, German Reformed, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, Tunkers, United Brethren, Congregationalists, Unitarians, Universalists, Weinbrennarians, and other sects, would here unite on the one brief platform: "*Resolved*, That that mysterious person, who calls himself the Lord Jesus Christ, is an imposter; and we solemnly warn all our congregations against him." An honest man, independent of all sect, might say: "Let him come to this glorious country, where liberty of conscience and liberty of press and speech abound; and I assure you, we will give him a better welcome." If he would only refute one universal error of all Protestant sects—say, for in-

stance, the doctrine of three persons in God, or their barbarous conception of the doctrine of atonement—I tell you again, the meeting-houses would be locked for him, the Protestant priesthood would warn their congregations against him, make very scientific speeches and lectures, according to the *common sense* of this free-thinking people of "America," and—Christ could do nothing. Suppose he gained some few friends, who would follow him; would they not immediately give them a name and call them a sect among the sects?

But, say all those sects and their priests, if Christ came, he would *not do so, and not speak so*, as your presumptions tell us. "No, no," says every one of them, "we are right; Christ would pronounce our doctrines sound." Infant baptism is right, and infant baptism is wrong. Predestination is right, and is wrong. Every thing is right. "No," say the Catholics, "we are right, you Protestants are wrong." "No," say the Protestants, "we have the Bible and know better; you are wrong." But, say you, if Christ came, and would give the world real evidence that he was the Lord himself, all would immediately acknowledge him, and the Millennium would be established. But I tell you, and call it presumption, or whatever you please, if Christ would come, with all the evidence of heaven, he would find no place on earth, and for a second time, *in our days*, he would have to exclaim: "*The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.*" You believe in the Lord's second Advent; and many of the present time live in full hope yet to experience his coming. Thank God, I am assured that many of them, especially those who expect this prophecy to be fulfilled in a spiritual manner, will not lay their weary heads on the cushion of their death-bed, without seeing their hopes fulfilled. But, I tell you *surely:* Christ has come already, but his own will not receive him.

The Johannical age is approaching. The light of that New Church already dawns upon the world; and the time will come, when its sun will shine upon this globe in all the majestic effulgence of its meridian splendor.

That "*New Church*" which pious historians and philosophers anticipate, must, of course, have a *new*, all-sufficing platform. And whence shall this platform come? Among Christian Churches you cannot find it. If this platform is yet to be established, the question then is, I say again, Whence will it come? I say, if it comes, IT MUST COME FROM HEAVEN. But if it comes from heaven, it cannot come otherwise but through the mediation of man, which at all times has been the manner in which God revealed His truth from heaven. And the medium of this revelation must be with a *pious* and *scientific* man. He must be a person who represents theology and philosophy; theology by a pure character, humility, and a pious life; philosophy by high scientific attainments and experience. The revelation given through such a medium, must be one which, based on the Bible and Nature, harmonizes with human reason, and which is capable to elevate both philosophy and theology to the highest degree. As such it must hold pace with all sciences in all ages, without contradicting itself, the Bible, Nature, or Reason, in the course of their pro-

gress. It must have its foundation in eternity, and must develope itself into immensity.

Now *exactly such a person* as required was that godly man Emanuel Swedenborg; and *exactly such a revelation* as required, is the one which God has given, through his mediation, to the world, and which Emanuel Swedenborg meekly and humbly confesses to have received from the Lord Jehovah, Jesus Christ.

He wrote his work in Latin, one of the most beautiful of all languages, and the best adapted for scientific and religious purposes. Especially was this the case in his time, when all the theological and the scientific world in general spoke and wrote this language. It is thus even remarkable that God, for the revelation and preservation of His truth, chose this very language. God always chooses for his mediation between Himself and us, the best vessels. The oldest or first revelations were given in the best of all then existing languages, the Shemitic. Hebrew is the vessel which conveyed to man the first and everlasting truths of God. No other language is better adapted for the mission which it has fulfilled. The second and more perfect revelation, in close connection with the preceding one, which it elevates by fulfilment, was given in the most beautiful language of the time, in Greek. The third, latest and most perfect revelation, is given us in Latin. The writings of Swedenborg are written in simple language. But profoundly deep is their sense. Their strain of thought flows like a crystal stream, which high on the mountain rock has its fountain. But as it flows, it grows larger and deeper, until, like a majestic river, it carries the reader on its full rounded waves of thought, like a ship, full of precious cargo, and finally it enters into the Ocean of Eternal Truth.

Time and Eternity, Space and Immensity, Philosophy and Theology, are happy playmates in the garden of his Theosophy. Here Wisdom and Love kiss each other in holy joy. What Denham says of the Thames, can truly be said of the writings of Swedenborg:

> "Though deep, yet clear, though gentle, yet not dull,
> Strong without rage, without o'erflowing full."

We are now prepared to enter somewhat deeper into our investigation of that question, "*Where lies the fault?*" And here we will add another question, viz., "Where is the remedy?" or, "Where is the anticipated platform?"

*The Fault*, I say, is to be found, 1st, in the corrupted doctrines of the sects, which all, more or less, contradict God's word and reason. 2d. In the facts themselves, and in their spirit, which opposes love and truth. Each sectarian lives a life of self-love. His religious proprium is the proprium of his respective sect. And from the peculiar stand-point which one sect assumes opposite to the other—one sect hates the other sect from its proprium.

*The Remedy* for this evil is to be found in the doctrines of the heavenly Jerusalem, as revealed from heaven through our Lord Jesus Christ, by means of his servant Emanuel Swedenborg.

I should like to commence with an introduction bearing upon the different Christian doctrines, and the church question; but as these lines are the product of but a few hours, and, inasmuch as my limited time does not permit me to dwell more particularly upon the general field of Dogmatics, I will therefore confine myself to but few remarks on some of the principal doctrines. I commence with the doctrine of

GOD, OR THE HOLY TRINITY.

The question here is, what do Protestant symbols teach on this doctrine in general, and what does the Lutheran Church teach about it in particular? Unitarians excepted, all Protestant and Roman Catholic Christians teach: There is *one* living and true God, and in the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power and eternity; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet are they not three Gods, but one God. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son. This is, without dwelling at present on the attributes of God, the common doctrine on the Trinity, as held by Catholics and Protestants. Now let us hear the Augsburg Confession, Art. I.:

"With unanimity it is held and taught, agreeably to the decree of the Council of Nice, that there is one divine essence only, which is called, and truly is, God, but that there are three persons in this one divine essence, equally powerful, equally eternal, God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, who are one divine essence, eternal, incorporeal, indivisible, infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness, the Creator and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible; and by the word *person* is not understood a part or quality of another, but that which subsists of itself, precisely as the Fathers have employed this term on the subject."

It is evident that the Protestant Church received this doctrine from the Roman Catholic Church. Luther says: "We have on this doctrine many precious books, St. Augustine, Hilary, Cyril, and this Article remained pure in Popedom, and with the scholastics. Thus we have no quarrel with them about it."*

But where do we find this doctrine in the word of God? We find the doctrine of the Trinity, for instance, in 1 *John* v. 7 (ὁι τρεις ἐν εισι), but where in the Holy Scriptures appears the term "*persons*," or "*three persons?*" The Bible speaks of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost (Matt. xxviii. 19; 1 Cor. xii. 4–6; 2 Cor. xiii. 14), as of essentials, which form one Divine Being, but never does it speak of three persons. The ecclesiastical system on the Trinity of persons was formed gradually in the IVth century, growing out of the disputes on the equality of the Son and Spirit with the Father. At the Councils of Nice, 325, and Constantinople, 381, this doctrine of the three-personality was firmly established. It is entirely the product of human irrationality.

* Man hat hiervon kœstliche Bücher, St. Augustini, Hilarii, Cyrilli, "und ist solcher Artikel im Papisthum und bie den Schul-Theologen rein blieben, dass wir daruber mit ihner keinen zank haben." See also *Schmalk. Artikel Theil I., Mo. I.–IV.*

In the Bible you do not find it. Men have fancied and forced it into the Bible. This doctrine is a perfect *contradictio in adjecto*, and utterly opposes the moral and intelligent nature of man's character. According to this doctrine, God is divided into three separate persons, and is at the same time one, and not divided into three separate persons. There is a unity in one essence, and a non-unity in one person. All three are co-equal, but the Father is not born of the Son, neither is the Father proceeding from the Spirit and the Son, nor the Son proceeding from the Father and the Spirit. All three are dependent upon each other, and all three are independent of each other. There are three distinctions in one non-distinction, and one non-distinction in three differences. Three are one, and one are three. This conception of the Trinity is the embodiment of Monotheism and Polytheism. Your imagination comprises three persons, but in reality according to reason, you acknowledge but one. Our feelings resist the idea, that God is threefold in person.* It presses inconveniently upon our feelings to think thus of God, and it leaves upon our souls the impression, this is wrong. Our reason, on the other hand, denounces the whole theory as contradiction and nonsense. Imagination tells you of a Trinity of persons, but reason declares unto you: "Hear, O Israel: Jehovah our God is one Jehovah. Thou shalt acknowledge no God beside me," Deut. vi. 4; Hosea xiii. 4. Thank God, a promise is given to men, which declares: "In that day, Jehovah shall be one, and his name one," Zech. xiv. 9. I know you wish to be understood, that the three persons in the Deity are not designed to be *tres Dei;* but *unus Deus. But they are tres Dei* (three Gods), according to both your confessions and your explanations. And the whole drift of arguments which are used now and then with all their cripple logic to support the doctrine of a three-personal God, dissolves itself into Deception, Phantasm, Contradiction, and Sophistry. God's word and reason tell us different from your creeds. Read Deut. vi. 4; Mark xii. 29; Is. xiv. 14; chap. xliv. 6; chap. xlv. 6; Hosea xiii. 4; Zech. xiv. 9, etc., etc.

The Bible testifies that there is but one God. Reason says it is so; and our feelings are melted before this holy fire of truth into longing and love after Jehovah. But that horrible idea of a three-personal God repulses man's reason, and hardens his heart. The free feelings within our breast appeal to our free intellect, whilst a cold church doctrine, destitute of love and life, closes the door of mercy, and leaves the better part of man outside in the cold winter of subjection and authority. Hence it is that so many confess in secret to themselves, "I never loved God; I know nothing of this love." And hence it is, that so many ministers talk of love towards God,—exhaust themselves by preaching on the subject; and still, preacher and congregation remain cold in their hearts. And not seldom a mere cold-hearted abstract obedience toward the law of God is mistaken for love toward

* The last stanza of the German hymn: "Herr Jesu Christ Dich zu uns wend," concludes thus:

"Ehr sei dem Vater und dem Sohn,
Dem heil'gen Geist in einem Thron,
Der heiligen *Dreifaltigkeit*
Sei Lob und Ehr in Ewegkeit."

God. Look upon experimental religion. What is it that cheers the heart of a Christian, who has commenced, as a "new-born" creature, the regeneration of his soul? His head is deeply immersed in the falsities of church doctrines; but one thing is right with him, that is, his heart loves Jesus. In Jesus he has the Father, and is happy. But does he think of a three-personal God? No, never. His heart dictates to him, there is but one God, and Jesus is this God. His head may have three Gods, but his heart has but one; and the latter is the cause of his happiness. Hence it is that new-born Christians feel an antipathy for investigating doctrines, because they know that their heart and head are in contradiction. Many upright men have felt this doctrine of the so-called orthodox churches to be not only an "*unfortunate infection with the strangest and most puerile of all deviations from the plain, unsophisticated import of God's revealed truth*," but they have boldly traced it to the proper source, and attributed its manufacture to the Father of lies.* It is, I know, of no avail to mention here the names of the most distinguished personages in the theological world of Germany, who have totally abolished this doctrine. I point you to some distinguished English divines, who approach a better understanding of the Holy Trinity in their attempted explanations of the incarnation of Jehovah. Read Dr. Adam Clark's Commentary on Luke i. 35, and a Sermon by the Rev. J. P. Durbin, Professor in Augusta College, Kentucky, on John i. 1–14. You find it in the "Methodist Preacher," 1852, p. 237. Professor Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Channing, confesses, "I could wish, indeed, on some accounts, that the word *person* had never come into the symbols of the churches, because it has been the occasion of so much unnecessary dispute and difficulty. I readily concede that the use of it ought to be so guarded, as not to lead Christians generally into erroneous views of God." Before he says, "We do not use it to describe independent, conscious beings, professing separate and equal essences and perfections."†

When sometimes it happens, that an intelligent lay-member requests his pastor to give him an "unsophisticated" logical answer and information on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, how does he get rid of such an innocent, yet intelligent sheep of his flock? By giving the most trivial answers. Such as, "*That is none of your business.*" Or, "*That is a mystery which we shall not know.*" Sometimes they use bad figures, connected with syllogisms, the middle term of which they slur without any conscientious scruples, because in such cases, the design sanctifies the means. Thus they escape the consequence of *contradiction*, which silently they acknowledge to themselves. If they are honest, they confess *to know nothing about it.* But how, I ask, can men, who do not understand themselves, condemn *others* because *they* do not comprehend what they themselves acknowledge not to know. What, I ask, is the "*proper sense*" of the Trinity? But most ridiculous appears a sentence of condemnation in a case, where a per-

* Here I read the views of many German divines from their original works.
† See Bush's "Statement of Reasons," p. 6, 7.

son believes in the abstract doctrine with them, but gives it an intelligible, unsophisticated, and uncontradictable interpretation.

Now, I will give you briefly a few intimations how to arrive to an intelligible, biblical understanding of the Holy Trinity. An intelligible answer does not involve the assumption to fathom the infinite depth of divine existence. "Who can find out the Almighty to perfection?" The unmeasureable depth of Deity can only be known to the unreachable self-consciousness of Deity itself. But God exists for man. If he exists for man, the man must be able to form an idea of God, according to his reasonable capacities. Man is the highest order of creatures. He has no conception of anything beyond himself. He can therefore only think of God as man, and not as something below or beyond himself. Man, as an animal, has no self-consciousness; he is only man as a spiritual being. Man is bound also to think of God, as man, according to God's own expression: "And God said, let us make man, after our likeness." "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him," Gen. i. 26, 27; Chap. v. 1; Chap. ix. 6. If man is created in the image of God, then God is, as prototype, the *absolute man;* and man, as his image, likeness, or portraiture, is God. This argument is supported by Christ, who says, John x. 34, 35: "Is it not written in your law, I said, *you are gods?* And the law cannot be broken." The passage to which the Lord refers seems to be Psalm lxxxii. 6, where we read thus: "I have said, ye are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High."

The so-called Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms which so often occur in the Bible corroborate the fact, that we shall think of God as man. Total ignorance of the first elements of language may try to escape from this so inconveniently pressing truth upon the mind of those who are in a different, or rather, no persuasion, by declaring these expressions to be figures of speech. Are figures of speech without sense? Especially, I ask, can they be without sense in the Word of God? If not, then accept the sense which these figures of speech contain. And the sense they contain is: Man is the Image of his great Prototype—God. But God did not create man as a three-personality; but as one. If there are three persons in God, man would be, as this image, a being of three persons. *But God is one; and man is one. Man is one, because God is one; and God is one because man is one.* But there is *in* man a Trinity of essentials, which together form one man. This Trinity in man consists of *Soul*, *Body*, and *Operation*, or proceeding Energy. *Transfer this conception to the Deity, and understand by the Father, "the primary ground of the Divine Being, which Swedenborg terms the divine esse, which is the divine Love; by the Son the divine Truth or Wisdom, which he terms the divine existere, and by the Holy Spirit, the proceeding act or energy, flowing forth from the united esse and existere, or Love and Wisdom, just as the energy or activity of a man is an emanation from his conjoint soul and body."**

---

* See Bush's "Statement of Reasons," p. 7.

If time would permit me, I would go on in my explanation, and try to remove what seems obscure and transcendental in this theory. I say there is but *one* God, and this our God, the eternal Father, became man. He clothed himself in our flesh and blood, as the divine *Logos*, and appeared among us in the form of divine Truth. Internally, although invisibly, in this divine Truth is the divine Love or Father. Not a part of Deity, not a so-called second person of the blessed Trinity, but Jehovah, the Omnipresent Jehovah, who is in all space, without space, became man. Let me try to bring this truth nearer to your understandings, by an illustration.* Look upon the murmuring brook, streaming through the odorous grove, in a beautiful summer night, when the moon's full face gilds its billows. The silver rays in full, bright effulgence, seem to be clothed in water. Yet it is but the resplendence of the moon. (Heb. i. 3. Who being the *apaugasma*, *resplendence*, *out-beaming* (not the brightness) of his glory, and the impression, character, of his hypostasis, or substance.) The resplendent, *apaugasma*, *below*, is the son of the Father (*doxes*, *glory*), in his full glory *above*. And yet they are not separated or different from each other. The full moon is in those rays, or the Son in the Father. Therefore, he who seeth the resplendence seeth the moon. Or, he who seeth the Son, he seeth the Father. Every little particle of the resplendence on the glittering brook below, is the full moon above. The Son-moon on earth below, is also the Father-moon in heaven above, John iii. 13. The separating cloud, which places itself between the brook and the moon, carries the resplendence from the brook upwards. The silver ray (the Son) goes back to its full glory, which it had before the brook itself even existed. John xvii. 5; Acts i. 9–11; Luke xiv. 51. There is no too much, and no too little therefore in those expressions of the Lord: "I and *the* Father are *one*;" "He that seeth me, seeth the Father." Or, as the Apostle expresses it; "In Him dwells bodily the fullness of Deity."

Now let us briefly view

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

How does the Protestant Church treat this important doctrine? The general idea is, that all men are under the curse of the law, because they do not fulfil what it demands of them. On this account, God's wrath, or the curse of the law, lay upon man. God's wrath righteously, therefore, condemns him to eternal hell-fire. Good works cannot appease this wrath. All men would have perished to hell, had God, the Father, not sent his eternally begotten Son, who is the second person of the blessed Trinity. He assumed flesh and blood, and thus became truly God and truly man in one person. During his lifetime, and especially towards the end of his life, he bore the wrath of God, and the curse of the law in his soul and body. Through these his sufferings he has appeased the wrath of the Father, and has done justice to the law; and thus, as a sacrifice for our sins, has redeemed both our souls and bodies from eternal condemnation, and has restored

* This illustration was overlooked when I read my defence.

to us the Father's favor. If man *repents* and *believes* in the vicarious death of the Lord Jesus Christ, the wrath of the Father and the curse of the law are removed, and the Lord's own righteousness is imputed to him. He then is just and holy *in* Christ. If he falls again, he must immediately repent and implore God's mercy. Christ, for this purpose, sitting at the Father's right hand, makes daily intercession. When, then, he dies, he goes to heaven. All the rest of his sinfulness he leaves behind himself, in the decaying body in the tomb. He himself comes home, as a blood-washed soul, all pure and righteous. Thus he remains in heaven, until the day of resurrection when he returns to the earth through the grave, where he receives a new body, formed of the spiritual elements of the old body; then he ascends to heaven, where he will be with Christ for ever and ever. *This is really the doctrine of the whole Protestant Church.* There is no idea contained in this statement, which is not fully sustained by your symbols.*

This conception of the atonement is a most horrible caricature of the truth. Satan could not have invented a more God-disgracing doctrine than the one you teach. The most barbarous heathen have not had as black a doctrine as this one. And this doctrine, you say, you find in the Bible! Where? The first inventor of this doctrine must have hated the Bible, or else he could never have circulated a system which so utterly contradicts that divine book, and which, in its logical and moral consequences, is so calculated to destroy Christianity. We ask, with a celebrated divine, "Do the sufferings of innocence cancel the debt of guilt?" If there is wrath in the Father, which is to be reconciled, must there not be equally as much wrath in the Son, who is co-equal with the Father? If Christ bore the wrath of the Father, who then bore the wrath of the Son? and of the Holy Ghost? Did the Son bear his own wrath and the wrath of the Holy Spirit of which he was conceived? Christ, suffering the punishment of hell, must then have been condemned by the Father, by himself, and by the Holy Spirit. But the Spirit witnessed, at all times, of God's love toward the world. And the Lord says, John iii. 16, "For so God *loved* the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life." You say, the majesty of the law has been offended, and the law demands that its curse be executed. But, then, I ask you, Is man made on account of the law, or is the law made on account of man? But suppose you were right, how then, I ask you, can you escape Universalism, or the consequence, that there is no punishment after death? If our sins are punished in Christ, for all men, why does God punish the same sins again on those who are condemned?† According to your doctrine, God really punishes the same sins three times. *First*, He punishes those sins in Christ. *Secondly*, He punishes them after death in those who are condemned. *Thirdly*, He punishes them, according to your system, on the day of resurrection and judgment.

---

* (*a*) Heidelberg Catechism—Quest. 37–44. (*b*) Augs. Conf. Art. 3 and 4. (*c*) Presb. larger Catechism—Quest. 55. (*d*) Conf. of the Presb. Church, Chap. III. (*e*) Etc., etc., etc.

† Calvinism, I know, escapes this consequence by an inconsequence.

The falsity of the system rests in the idea, that *God* is reconciled *to the world.* But the Bible always says the contrary, viz: that *the world* was reconciled *unto God.* It says, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself; not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation," 2 Cor. v. 19.

Again: "And you that were sometime alienated, and enemies in your minds, by wicked works, yet now has he reconciled (you) in the body of his flesh through death," Col. i. 20, 21. "Yes," say you, "but is it not written, Isaiah liii. 5, 'The chastisement of our peace was upon him.'" No, no, it is not. That passage is to be translated by *paideia eirenes*, and reads thus: "The *discipline or doctrine of our peace* is upon him." But granted, that your wrong translation was right, it speaks nothing in favor of your doctrine. And a dark passage of the Old Testament must always be explained according to the bright light of the New. But, say you, did not John the Baptist say: "Behold the Lamb of God, which beareth the sins of the world." Certainly; but how do you understand this? Did he bear them in a bundle, wrapped up, on his shoulders? In his hand? In his memory? Or how? He bore them, as a representative of humanity in the assumed human from the Virgin Mary. He bore them also, in so far as he endured all the sins done against him, with patience and meekness. He bore them in his assumed human, which he purified and cleansed from all possible evil propensities and promptings, and making his human invincible, he glorified it. But let me now give you briefly a few intimations how the doctrine of the atonement must be understood. I will adapt myself, as much as possible, to your own terminology, in order that I may level myself to your comprehension. To members of the heavenly Jerusalem, I would use other language, and treat the whole matter entirely different.

The necessity and importance of the atonement will be more properly understood, if we view the condition of mankind before the birth of Christ. It was not a single person, or persons, who were to be redeemed, but the human family in general. The end for which man was created, was eternal happiness. This happiness consists in living in close connection with God, by doing his will, which is Truth and Love. Our first parents, being created in the image of God, possessed the power to live according to their destination, in happy communion with God. They were really in a happy condition, when in Paradise. Then they knew no love of self. They were perfectly free and independent *in their dependence upon God.* The human family which, in all after ages was to be, was then included in their person. The fall of man, which consisted in turning off from God's love to the love of self, was, in its nature, self-destruction, or death. God said to Adam, before his fall, "The day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," Gen. ii. 17. Since the fall has taken place, evil propensities have become hereditary from parents to children. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by him; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." As thus all men were lost, they, therefore, were also all under the necessity of being redeemed. But how could this redemption be effected? The fall

of man consisted in non-obedience and disbelief in regard to the will of God. Obedience and Faith are the only possible substitute. And these are really demanded of us by God, because they alone can make us happy.—Micah ii. 8. But human depravity increased so much, that the law of conscience became almost extinct. God, therefore, gave to man the law of Moses. But experience has convinced man, that he is unable to fulfil the law without supernatural power. The law without this power is not able to redeem us. The requirements of the law are, "Love toward God and the neighbor;" but our love of self weakens our will-power to do so.—Rom. vii. 15. But the supernatural power which enables man to do God's will could not be given unto man without a medium. The power itself was the Spirit of God. *But how could God give us of his Spirit, and thereby the power* of renovation and progress in holiness, without removing first the obstacle of reception which was between us and Him, namely, the power of evil? He therefore condescended to come in the flesh, subjugated in his body the power of evil, and made his body the medium through which, as through a channel, if I may say so, he could impart to us the same spirit in which he overcame, and by which can enable us likewise to overcome. Before the Lord departed from his disciples, it was of great importance that he breathed on them, and said unto them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," John xx. 22. Man's will and man's life are not to be viewed separately. His will is his life. Shall man's life be changed;—then his will must be changed. *If his will should first be annihilated*, before giving him a new will, then he would not be the same being any more. He is then destroyed, and a new being would be in his place. All therefore that is necessary, is to remove from his will what is evil and, connecting the will of God with the good which remains in man's will, renew him. I know I come here in contact with your doctrine of man's *total* depravity, which I deny. There is in man a natural light, which forms the connecting link for God's spirit. Christ speaks of this light thus: "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" From the first Adam all receive the spirit of evil; but in the Lord Jesus Christ a second Adam was given to humanity, from whom all are enabled to receive the spirit of Good. It was an impossibility for man to receive this spirit in any other way and manner, because it was an impossibility for him to ascend to heaven, and assume the divine nature. But it was possible for God to descend to earth and assume the human nature. And God did condescend from heaven in the Lord Jesus Christ, who, as the Word or Divine Truth, clothed himself in our flesh and blood, and became thus a second representative of humanity, or the second Adam. The word of God expresses this truth thus: "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one *the free gift* came upon all men unto justification of life." And again: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh," Rom. viii. 3, 4. Scripture says: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many

be made righteous," Rom. v. 19. As Scripture has indicated to us the cause of unrighteousness, or the manner in which man became a sinner, placing it in Adam's disobedience, so also it makes us acquainted with the reasons and means which remove the damage done by Adam's disobedience; placing it in Christ's obedience. Obedience then is the principle of atonement.

The Lord in assuming the sinful human nature of man, placed himself in the category of man and under the obligation of fulfilling the law. Thus, as the Son of man, and as the Son of God, and especially as the Mediator between God and man, it became his holy commission to restore to man his loss. But this he could only do by purifying the assumed Human, in which, as the second Adam, he represented mankind. To accomplish this object, he had to remove out of his Human the vicious inclination of resisting God's will, to destroy totally the love of self, and to institute the power of loving God above all things. Thus his body became the medium by means of which man receives inclinations and powers opposite to those to which we are all subject by birth from Adam. This the Lord accomplished. Eight days after his birth he was circumcised, and put under the law. The circumcision was not a mere unmeaning sign. It was a sign which denoted that there was a something too much in human nature, which, in a painful manner, had to be removed. This "*too much*" was the law of disobedience, of sin, of unrighteousness. The Lord Jesus Christ, in fulfilling the law and conquering sin, subjugated to himself the powers of evil and thereby the Hells, and became thus before heaven and hell, angels and men, the righteous Redeemer of mankind. From his birth onward until his death on Calvary, he was under the severest temptations. These temptations, being designed by Hell as means to destroy the work of salvation, accomplished the very opposite of their diabolical intentions; viz., the glorification of the Lord's assumed Human. It accomplished *thereby* the invincibleness of his *Human*. Many have ascribed the Lord's sufferings to his Heavenly Father, but the Lord himself attributed them to Satan. He says, on his way to Gethsemane, "The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing *in* me."—John xiv. 30. And: "This is the hour of darkness." The Lord was permitted to be tempted by Satan, and he was well aware that his Human had to undergo this trial without being assisted by the power of the Father. The Father even had to forsake him, in order that Satan could not say, the Father had shielded him. He prays: "Father save me from this hour, but for this cause came I into this hour." And at last: "My God! My God! Why hast thou forsaken me?" The Lord overcame all temptations, and victoriously descended down to hell, and afterwards ascended upwards to heaven. He fulfilled the law by doing what it demanded, and thus overcame, by righteousness, unrighteousness. Thus he became our Redeemer, dying for us on the cross and atoning the world in his flesh with the Father, who dwelt in him. And thus he reconciled the world to himself. Christ's obedience is the central point in the doctrine of atonement. "Though he were the Son, yet learned he obedience by things which he suffered; *and being made perfect*, he became the *Au-*

*thor* of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him; called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec."—Heb. v. 7–10. And now: "*Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus*, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."—Phil. ii. 5–11.

### THE RESURRECTION.

With regard to charge II., I know from God's holy word, that man, according to what it calls his soul, is an immortal spirit. That the soul is his *ipse*, the very man himself. This soul, which is at the same time his spiritual body, is in form in exact correspondence with his external material body. It possesses similar series of parts and features as his external body. Man is a thinking, feeling, immortal creature, by virtue of his spiritual body and not by virtue of his material one. According to his material body, which serves to him as a medium of communication with this world, he is a mortal being. But according to his soul, or spiritual body, which Paul calls the inner man or spiritual body, he is immortal and an inhabitant of the spiritual world. During his life on earth, man dwells consciously in the material and unconsciously in the spiritual world. When he dies, he lays his material body aside and never re-assumes it again. His condition is then reversed, viz.: he dwells consciously in the spiritual and is no more a percipient of the material world. Man's resurrection, therefore, takes place immediately after death, in his spiritual body. Neither Paul nor the Augsburg Confession teach a resurrection of the human material body. I therefore believe Paul, who plainly says, "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest *not that body that shall be.*" "So also in the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a *natural body*, and there *is* a *spiritual body*."

In my arguments on the Trinity and Atonement, you find the key to Soterology, or the doctrine of salvation, contained, and it would be partly but a repetition if I should separately treat on the doctrine of redemption. You see then, my brethren, that I base my faith entirely upon the Bible. I stand on holy ground. And upon this holy ground I stand without the shoes of any human authority, such as symbols or creeds. Dr. Martin Luther laid down as a rule for the council at Mantua, "The Word of God shall furnish articles of faith; beside it,

nobody, even no angel."* Thus I am taught by Dr. Martin Luther. This rule I follow. And *thus* I am a Lutheran.

I believe that Emanuel Swedenborg was, as a messenger of Jehovah, the Herald of the heavenly Jerusalem; and I am positive that the New Jerusalem Church is the Church of coming ages. This church cannot be joined, like a sect, according to formulas of discipline. And not Swedenborg, but the doctrines of a heavenly Jerusalem, and a holy life, according to its doctrines, alone, constitute a member of the heavenly Jerusalem. He, who is not in both, in the Truth and in the Love of the heavenly Jerusalem, is no member of the same. The enjoyment of New Church membership is entirely spiritual. I believe not in Swedenborg; but in those precious doctrines of the heavenly Jerusalem, which were given to men by means of him through our Lord Jesus Christ. Swedenborg was but an instrument in God's hand. You and the world may call him whatever you please. I know he is hated. Hated are also those whom the world pleases to nickname *Swedenborgians*. But whence this hatred? Whence such persecution? It is the truth of the Heavenly Jerusalem; it is the word of God in its true sense which is hated. Swedenborg wrote not with the intention to create a sect; and it is left entirely to me, whether I will remain in the bonds of that church in which I am born. He himself was a Lutheran. He lived and died a Lutheran. In his last solemn hours he received the Lord's Supper from the hands of a Lutheran clergyman. But if we are thrown out of our ecclesiastical connection, then we seek for our friends, join heart and hand together, and form a brotherly society. And the principles of such societies are always,

Jesus our All!
Truth and Love our rule in life and death!

Thus we remain a seed among the nations. Our number is small; but we await a time when the sun of heaven shall smile upon the children of this globe as children of the heavenly Jerusalem.

### USE OF N. C. LITURGY.

*I regret to say*, that I never used the New Church Liturgy, neither did I introduce their publications into my Sunday-school or congregation. And never did I express to anybody my disbelief in the writings of Moses or Paul. What regards my ordination vows; I never broke them! I am ordained on the Bible. The Bible I do truly believe to be God's precious word. With it I stand; without it I fall; and not according to the Augsburg Confession, which you do not believe yourselves. On the Augsburg Confession, or any other symbol, I have never been ordained. I believe, however, that the Augsburg Confession sets forth the essential doctrines of the Bible. By this I always understood nothing else but the mere abstract doctrines. Such as, 1. There is one God; and in God there is a Trinity, viz., Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

---

* "Das Wart Gottes soll Artikel des Glaubens stellen, und sonst Niemand, auch kein Engel."

2. We are atoned through Christ, the incarnate God; and by regeneration through the Holy Spirit we are saved. "Not by our own works, or self-righteousness, but by grace, through love and faith. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works."—Eph. xi. 10.

3. That Baptism is a sign of introduction into the Church, and a memorial that man is to be regenerated.

4. The Holy Supper, being an institution of the Lord in commemoration of him, by means thereof we are connected with heaven and with the Lord; and that this is the most holy thing of worship.

5. The immortality of the soul, and man's resurrection after death in a spiritual body, which is his soul.

6. Life everlasting for God's blessed, and death everlasting for our unregenerated lost brethren after the flesh.

These I deem to be those essential doctrines. These I always have believed, and do firmly believe them now. You have *never* told me what essential doctrines in general, or essential doctrines of the Augsburg Confession in particular, are; and the church has never as yet arrived to an understanding which and what the essential doctrines of the Augsburg Confession are, although, on this point especially, she has been disputing for many years without coming to an understanding and decision.

And now, my brethren, I am done. I love you all. There is not one here whom I do not love. Must we part; well, then, I can part in peace and brotherly love. I can cheerfully give you my right hand, and from all my heart I can assure you that my well-wishing love goes with you. As long as I was among you, I can say, I have always lived a moral life, and have sustained a good character. If I must depart from you, then I can say I leave you as an honest and upright man. I hope, however, to see you again. If not here below —above.

"While we walk this vale of tears,
Compass'd round with care and sorrow,
Gloom to-day, and storm to-morrow,
Meet again! our bosom cheers."

Go, brethren, render your verdict.

---

NOTE.

The Verdict in the above case was rendered in the following form:

"WHEREAS, the Rev. Arthur Otto Brickman, a Minister of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and a member of the West Pennsylvania Synod, has confessed his belief in all the theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, which writings do teach doctrines contrary to some of the fundamental truths of the Word of God, as taught in the Augsburg Confession, and as held by Protestants generally; Therefore,

"*Resolved*, 1st. That in the opinion of this Conference, the charge which has been preferred againt him, of fundamental error in doctrine, has been fully sustained.

"*Resolved*, 2d. That the said Rev. A. O. Brickman be and is hereby suspended from all ministerial functions, according to Section VI. and IX. of Article 12 of the Formula of Government and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, until this action of Conference shall be confirmed or reversed by the Synod of West Pennsylvania."

AN

# AFFECTIONATE REMONSTRANCE

AGAINST A

# FREQUENT ABUSE

OF THE

# PULPIT AND THE RELIGIOUS PRESS,

OCCASIONED BY

A DISCOURSE PREACHED IN DEERFIELD, (Ms.,) APRIL 29, 1855.

AND A

NOTICE OF IT IN A BOSTON PAPER.

---

By SAMUEL WILLARD,
*Formerly Minister of Deerfield.*

---

GREENFIELD:
CHARLES A. MIRICK, PRINTER.
1856.

# PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS AND REVIEWS.

In the "Congregationalist" for August 3d, appeared the following editorial notice of the Valedictory Sermon of Rev. A. E. Ives, lately preached in Deerfield, which editorial was illustrated and carried into practical effect by the insertion of a note, appended to the Sermon.

EDITORIAL.

"The tone of this farewell discourse is faithful and judicious, and some of its incidental revelations of facts are worthy being widely circulated, in token that the age of religious persecution has not gone wholly by, and that 'Liberal' Christians can be as illiberal and persistently ungenerous and harsh, as any body ever was. Read the following note:

"With the first efforts to re-establish in Deerfield an Orthodox Church, commenced a series of abuses and outrages continued to the present time, directed against the place of worship and all pertaining to it,—against the pastors,—against those connected with the Church and Society. Simple attendance on a prayer meeting has been a cause of dismissal from the office of common school teacher. The first place of meeting during the hours of worship, was assailed by clubs, with hootings and disturbing noises. The present house of worship has been subject to frequent abuse; loud stamping and jumping on the steps; opening the door and whistling in time of worship; contemptuous and profane language often written on the door; six bell-ropes cut and stolen away; the steps of the house very many times torn up on Saturday night; the flooding of the house at night by an engine; the breaking of blinds and windows, and the thrusting through them of sticks of timber into the interior of the church; trees around it repeatedly girdled and otherwise injured. Things like these

have been common, and the more flagrant of them have been quite recent. The pastors of the Church have been treated with contumely in the public streets, with profane and disrespectful epithets. Consistency and fidelity by members of the Church, have never failed to draw upon them marked disrespect and a surprising degree of falsehood and slander. Those connected with the Church and Society have been subjected to almost uninterrupted personal reproach. A professional gentleman, of high standing as a man, a physician, and a Christian, coming in by invitation, and unexceptionable in his deportment, was recently, by insult, by abounding slander, by various abuse, driven from the place. The activity and zeal evinced in originating and circulating all manner of slanderous reports, tending to bring the members of the Church and Society and the cause of truth into disrepute, and to awaken against them prejudice and bitter hostility, could hardly be credited by those not having personal knowledge, sometimes even blinding and deceiving the friends of truth. The circulation of falsehood, and the branding of all correction of falsehood as an 'orthodox lie,' seems a favorite method of action. Indeed, so extravagant and persistent, perhaps peculiar, has been the course of abuse here, that one not directly cognizant of the facts, could hardly give them credence, could by no means appreciate the condition of those who have here taken their stand for Christ. We can appreciate the value of professed 'charity' and exclusive 'liberality' in matters of religion. We must be pardoned, however, if the spirit and the life weigh heavier in our judgment than mere profession. We can also distinguish between the quietness of manner with which these outrages are sometimes disapproved or ignored, and the spirit that excites them. We can understand too that at times it may be felt the matter has been carried a little farther than policy would dictate.

"This course of treatment has been unprovoked, and has been borne quietly and patiently, perhaps with less complaint than was meet, with the hope that decency, if not better principle, might prevail. If, however, it be the legitimate effect of the system of error which we reject, we must say, 'Instruments of cruelty are in their habitations: O my soul, come not thou into their secrets; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united.'"

Such an endorsement of such charges, which, so far as they are aimed at the Unitarian Society in Deerfield, we know to be as groundless as they are reproachful, seem to demand a reply; and accordingly the following communication was sent to the office of the "Congregationalist," with a request that it might be allowed a place in that paper.

# THE OTHER SIDE OF THE CASE.

[FOR THE "CONGREGATIONALIST."]

MESSRS. EDITORS:

In your paper of August 3d, you notice the Valedictory Sermon of Rev. A. E. Ives, lately delivered to his people in Deerfield, and publish at full length a note connected with that discourse, in which are contained a multitude of accusations, most evidently directed against the Unitarian Society in that place; and, as appears from your short, but emphatic editorial, so understood by you. These accusations, on their first publication, filled us with inexpressible astonishment and grief; but it was generally thought best to bear the reproaches in silence, and leave the readers of that note to judge for themselves whether such charges, with all their implications, were to be believed on the naked assertion of one, who, in most of the cases, could not have been an original witness, but must have received the reports of others, long after the outrages occurred. When, however, it appeared that you gave full credence to every accusation, and recommended the wide circulation of the sermon and the note, we thought it was a matter of justice to ourselves, to all the candid readers of your paper, and to the cause of Christ, to state in a mild and pacific manner, such facts and probabilities as we believe will show that we are as free from all responsibility for the alleged outrages, where the facts themselves were anything more than idle rumors, as the inhabitants of any other town in the neighborhood. Accordingly a committee was appointed to make such statements,

which we now present as a communication for your paper; and we trust that you will not think it unreasonable for us to request a hearing in the same court, in which so many grave indictments have been found, recorded and published. We have endeavored to make our defense as summary and brief as the nature of the case would permit; but still it is longer than we could have wished. When, however, you consider that the charges against us are many and various, without such a specification of time, place and persons, as would facilitate an appropriate response, and when you further consider that you have condensed into the few lines of your editorial, connected as it is with Mr. Ives' note, more meaning than would often be found in as many columns, you will not, we presume, reject our communication on account of its length.

Before we enter on our defense, we wish to guard the reader against any mistake in respect to the real *issue* between us and Mr. Ives. It is not whether all the professors in our Church give full evidence of personal religion, and we do not believe that any modest man will say there is any Orthodox Church in all New England, where such a pretense can be maintained. Nor do we say that, as a society, or as individuals, we have always been as *conciliatory* as we ought to have been, avoiding everything wrong, and doing everything which might be justly expected by our Orthodox brethren. In the view of an impartial judge, most probably it has not been so; for when or where was there ever an ecclesiastical division in which, for the first twenty years, there was not something to be censured on both sides, and especially that of the stronger party? The

true and only issue is, and we wish the reader to keep it constantly in mind, whether we are guilty of the outrageous persecutions with which we are charged in the sermon and note of Mr. Ives. One thing further we would request of the reader, viz: that he have the note, if not the sermon, constantly before him, that he may see whether we quote fairly; and understand the drift of what we say when we do not quote, but simply refer to those documents.

Of the many charges contained in the note, some are specific, and some general and complex. With such a thorough analysis, as would be made in a judicial court, the number would be multiplied to an extent that would surprise any one who has not carefully examined them; to four or five times ten, yea, to as many hundreds of thousands, perhaps; and especially when a teeming imagination is appealed to for supplying what the author, with his rare command of the English language, finds it difficult to express. Still, with the most perfect analysis, we do not believe there would be any one charge, that could be so simplified and separated from everything else, as to render it possible for the complainant to sustain it by any competent evidence, in the extent in which it was intended to be understood. In saying this, however, we do not mean to say or insinuate that the author is chargeable with any intentional misrepresentation.

We are conscious that the charity which "thinketh no evil," prompts us to seek for the best apology in his favor, which our reason or imagination can furnish. We believe that his labors in Deerfield have been far less effectual, than his sanguine temperament led him

to expect; and we know that one attempt to promote the interests of his Society, in which he felt a deep concern, was an entire failure. These disappointments, aggravated by the pains of neuralgia, or some other acute disease, seem to have bewildered a mind, which we know to be philosophical, logical, and amply stored with valuable information; and while we lament the sad consequences of this mental disease, we hope the reader will make the best apology for the author which is within the bounds of credibility,—we had almost said *possibility*.

It will not be expected that we should give separate answers to all the accusations contained in the note. All that we can do within our expected limits, is to show the reader what we know, or believe to be probable in regard to a few of the more prominent charges, and then, with some general remarks, to leave him to judge what credit is due to the others.

The first accusation to which we would call the reader's attention, is one of those which are contained in the introductory sentence. "With the first efforts to re-establish in Deerfield an Orthodox Church, commenced a series of abuses and outrages, continued to the present time, directed against the place of worship and all pertaining to it,—against the pastors," &c. The charge on which we are about to remark, when separated from all others and reduced to a grammatical form, will stand thus: From the establishment of the Orthodox Society in Deerfield, of which Mr. Ives had been pastor, to the present time, a series of abuses and outrages had been directed against all the successive ministers. The expressions are as unlimited as they could possibly have been.

Providentially we have the means of proving by incontestible evidence that there is some exaggeration in this assertion. The Rev. Pomroy Belden, though never inducted in the usual form into the office of pastor over the Orthodox Church in this place, supplied the pulpit and was to all intents and purposes the pastor of that people from 1837 to 1842, five years more or less; and we have an extract from his farewell sermon, copied for us by a member of the first Church in Amherst, whose name, if mentioned, would, we think, be sufficient surety with all who know him, that the transcript was faithful and exact. The extract we now give, preceded by a few words of the copyist, which are necessary to throw light on some expressions in the latter part of the extract. These prefatory words we enclose in brackets.

[After speaking of his obligations to his own people for their attentions to him, he writes thus:] "From the members of the other Society, also, though differing from me in religious sentiment, I have received uniform kindness and respect—every expression of which I have endeavored carefully to notice, and treasure up in the deep recesses of a heart that *knows* gratitude. For such expressions you will now accept my sincere thanks; and my prayer for you and all this people is, that you may treat my *Master* as well as you have treated me, his unworthy servant."

Thus it appears that the outrages against the pastors, with which we are charged in the indictment, had no earlier date than the commencement of Mr. Seymour's ministry, on March 1st, 1843, the time of his ordination; and the complainant may have reason to regret,

that in his charges he went back so many years before he had any personal acquaintance with the people of Deerfield.

Rev. Henry Seymour, successor of Mr. Belden, resided among us six years, beginning March 1st, 1843, and ending March 14th, 1849, the close of his ministry in Deerfield. In what manner he was treated may be inferred from the following letter, which was written in reply to one from the Chairman of the Committee, in which he was distinctly informed why and for what use his testimony was desired. The letter might, perhaps, be abridged, but we are aware of the delicate position into which his candor has brought him; and, fearing lest by any omission we should inadvertently render that position still more trying and unpleasant, we give the letter at full length.

HAWLEY, August 20, 1855.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

Yours of the 15th inst. was received on Saturday; and I hasten to answer it at my earliest convenience.

In your letter you request me to furnish you an extract from my Valedictory Sermon, in which I spoke of the treatment which I had received from the members of your Society. And in case I see fit to decline that, you wish me to state whether I have experienced any such outrages as those mentioned in the note to Mr. Ives' Sermon.

I would here say that I should be glad to be excused from making a reply to your communication. But, as I must confess, your request is a reasonable one, I will comply, though at the sacrifice of some personal feelings. You will allow me to be brief.

In regard to an allusion to the members of your Society in my Sermon, I would observe that I have found in it no such allusion of any kind. If there was any in the delivery of the Sermon, it must have been brief and extempore. I would willingly furnish it, if I knew what it was.

In regard to the treatment which I received from the members of your Society during my residence in Deerfield, I feel bound to say that it was kind and respectful, so far as I remember. I have no memory for injuries, and if I received any such while I was among you, I have not laid them up. I do not think that I did. I certainly can remember much of kind

treatment, both from yourself and from many of your people, for which I am truly grateful.

Permit me to say, that, from my knowledge of Mr. Ives, I am confident that he did not intentionally misrepresent in reference to this matter. He must have been informed from some source which he supposed reliable; but, so far as the information had respect to myself, I am obliged to say, that it was not correct.

I believe that I have now fully replied to your inquiries, and I will add no more. Yours, very respectfully,

HENRY SEYMOUR.

Rev. Samuel Willard, D. D.

That Mr. Seymour is disposed to forget injuries, and remember acts of kindness, we cordially and fully believe; but we shall be permitted to say that his Christian attainments must be far above what are common, if, with a memory so tenacious of kindness received, he has obtained such dominion over himself, that he can not only *forgive* great abuses, but so readily *forget* them, if indeed they have ever befallen him.

From the preceding testimonies it is sufficiently apparent that, so far as *the Pastors* are concerned, the Rev. Mr. Ives has been the sole victim of the abuses and outrages, with which we are charged; the sole martyr to the cause of Christ and his truth; and here it might be supposed that he would be a more competent witness of the facts alleged. Before we enter on this new ground, however, it may be important to remind the reader of the length and breadth of the charge. It seems intended to involve all the members of the Unitarian Society, without distinction; professors and pastors, no less than others; nay, as may appear from page 11, still more than others. Against this charge, though we might bring the positive testimony of many candid persons in the Orthodox Society, we think it will be sufficient to give our own very

simple statement of indisputable facts; for we cannot believe that the Christian community in general will disregard that right, which is conceded by our civil courts, and even by the laws of Pagan Rome, to those who are charged with the highest offences; that of being heard in their own defence.

We say, then, that if Mr. Ives has ever suffered as he represents, the facts have wholly escaped our knowledge, with this exception, that rumors have come to us that some indignities have been cast on him by boys in the streets; but who those boys were, or whether they belonged to either of the religious Societies, we have not been told.

On the other hand, we aver that we, and, as we believe, our Society generally, have uniformly treated him with kindness and respect, so far as our modes of expression corresponded with the feelings of our hearts. When he brought his family to Deerfield, the doors of hospitality were opened in both religious Societies. In his deep and repeated afflictions we sympathized with him and his, and expressed our sympathy as well as we knew how. In return, he visited *us* in our bereavements, and with apparently kind feelings, for which we gave him full credit; and he endeavored to soothe our griefs with the consolations of the Gospel. Some of us were *sick* as it were to death, and he kindly called at our houses, was introduced into the sick chamber, as cordially as our own minister would have been, where we listened to his conversation and invited his prayers; in which exercises our souls were apparently brought into a divine communion, and the promise of Christ, "where two or three are gathered together in my name,

there am I in the midst of them," seemed to be fulfilled. From such experience we were led to entertain the delightful hope, that the time was at hand, when all "who love *the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity*," would love and trust one another. How unfounded, alas! was the hope, so far as it rested on our acquaintance with Mr. Ives! We have been deeply disappointed and grieved. Had these charges come from one who knew nothing of us, but what he learned from hearsays of hearsays, we could have borne it; but it was a very different thing that they should have originated with one who had so intimately known us, with whom we had "taken sweet counsel," although we had not often "walked to the house of God in company." Still we are not conscious of any resentment toward him. Except from regard to his final happiness, we think it is not in our hearts to wish him so much suffering, as will be inseparable from the regret he will feel, if he is ever brought to realize *how great a wrong he has done us*, and how deep a wound he has inflicted on that benignant religion, which was designed to make men at once devout toward God, and just, generous, and unassuming in all the intercourse of social life.

Another charge in the note is expressed in these words: "Simple attendance on a prayer-meeting has been a cause of dismissal from the office of a common school teacher." After many enquiries, we have heard of only one person, who professes to remember any such fact; and, supposing it were proved that such a dismission did take place soon after the teacher's attendance on the prayer-meeting, and that it was done at the instance of one or more Unitarians, two

other things must be proved, in order to substantiate the charge in its full implication, viz: that such attendance was the *principal* cause of ejection, and that it was generally *approved* by the *Unitarian Society.* Till this be done, we think we may be excused from any further reply to this charge.

Again, it is said in the note, "A professional gentleman of high standing as a man, a physician, and a Christian, coming in by invitation, and unexceptionable in his deportment, was recently, by insult, by abounding slander, by various abuse, driven from the place." To this accusation, we give, without argument, or remark, a simple statement of facts, which, in all material points, we can readily prove.

In the spring or summer of 1853, to make a long story short, Dr. Stephen W. Williams, who, since the death of his father, in 1829, had been the principal physician in the north part of Deerfield, announced his expectation of removing to the far West, which he did in October. A few weeks before his removal, a gentleman by the name of Gale, who for several years had been in the practice of medicine, called on him with credentials and recommendations, which satisfied Dr. W. so well, that he committed to him the patients then under his care, and thus far, at least, recommended him to the patronage of others. Some critical cases very soon occurred, and were treated with such skill and success, that Dr. Gale was soon established in general confidence. But Mr. Ives and some of his friends, thinking, as they well might do, that it would be greatly for the interest of their Society if the permanent physician of the place were one, who would throw

his whole influence into their scale, invited a young gentleman by the name of Trow, who was not yet out of the medical school, and consequently was without experience, to come and enter into competition with Dr. Gale, who, with all his advantages, had been on the ground about three months, and, as has been already observed, had been successful beyond what is common in securing the confidence of our people. It was a settled point that the practice in this place would not support two physicians, and consequently the success of one must be the defeat of the other. Strenuous means, therefore, must be adopted to withdraw patronage from Dr. Gale, and transfer it to Dr. Trow; and such measures were put in operation, as *we* thought very objectionable, and such as several families in the Orthodox Society were, as we are credibly informed, very far from supporting or approving. If these things drew forth from persons of little reflection sayings or doings unpleasant or unjust to Dr. Trow, it was no more than might have been expected. We have not yet heard, however, of more than one act of this kind; that of taking down the sign from his office, and putting it up on the Orthodox Church, or, as some say, on the arch of the burial ground; and this, so far as we have learned, has never been approved by any real member of our Society. The attempt to supersede Dr. Gale in his practice was a failure; and, after an experiment of some months, Dr. Trow very wisely, we believe, embraced an opportunity, if not an invitation, to go to a place where the prospect of business was more hopeful.

Before we advert to any of the other charges, it may

be well to offer a few general remarks, which will enable us to dispose of them in a more summary, and at the same time a more satisfactory manner.

First, then, we observe that, in order to prove us obnoxious to any one of these charges, it must be analyzed into four minor ones, each of which must be distinctly proved, viz: that the act was *committed*, that it was done by some member of *our Society*, that it was *generally approved*, and that it flowed from the spirit of *persecution*. If the second, third and fourth particulars are not proved, there is no evidence of our guilt. That the third should ever be proved, is incredible, and that the fourth should be, is impossible, unless the following assertion from the note can be proved: "This course of treatment has been *unprovoked*, and has been borne quietly and patiently." With so logical a mind as that of Mr. Ives, we think that a few moments of cool reflection would have shown him that it is, in the nature of things, impossible to prove what is here asserted by any other evidence, than the *explicit testimony* of Omniscience, or such a degree of *clairvoyance*, as few disciples of Mesmer ever claimed for themselves or others; a *limited omniscience*, at least, which, for twenty years must have followed the victims of persecution into every scene, in which they have met their malignant foes, minutely observing their every action, word, look, and tone of voice.

In the second place, we would call the attention of the reader to one of the most common propensities of our nature, one of its *appetites*, we might say; desire of *amusement;* an appetite, which manifests itself in little children, when they throw books or other valuable

things into the fire; in larger boys and girls, when, for their amusement, they vex their sisters or mothers; and in those who should be young men, when they prowl the streets by night, doing more *wanton* mischief. At first this propensity is innocent, then little more than thoughtless, afterward selfish; and finally, as not unfrequently happens, equally diabolical in itself, and abusive to others, against whom it is directed. It has been common, we believe, in all ages of the world. Such things occurred in the times of our Puritan Fathers; and, notwithstanding the strictness of their domestic government, were, perhaps, as frequent then as they are now. Such unruly boys and young men there were in this town, before the term Unitarian was ever heard in the place. Such there have been ever since, and some there are now, who belong, perhaps, in equal proportions to the Unitarian and Orthodox Societies, and those families which are connected with no Society; and, if *rum* continues to be freely sold within three or four miles, this state of things is likely to continue for ages to come.

As instances of what occurred in Puritanic times, tradition says that, during the ministry of Rev. J. Ashley, the second pastor of Deerfield, a *sheep* was put one Saturday night on the sounding-board over the pulpit, where she remained till some time the next day; and that a hog's trough was thrown into the well of Rev. J. Taylor, Mr. Ashley's successor; and in the puritanic town of Athol, about seventy years ago, one of us saw, with his own eyes, that a great proportion of the glass in the windows of the meeting-house, which stood in a lonely place, had been broken out;

which was said to have been done with stones by unprincipled men or boys, as they passed the house; and these ruins remained for many months, if not for years, the worshippers having too little resolution to replace the glass, which might soon be broken again.

Those, who duly consider the preceding statements and remarks, will, we believe, very easily account for the villainies mentioned in the note, in a way more probable, if not more charitable, than that of imputing them to *us;* or as the complainant seems to have intended, to our peculiar faith, which cannot be shown to be responsible for these things by any kind of argument, which would not equally prove that *genuine* Christianity, wherever it is professed, is accountable for all the crimes it fails to prevent. We shall, therefore, notice only two of the remaining charges, and that very briefly. Among the outrages, said to have been committed on the house of worship, are the breaking of blinds and windows, and the thrusting through them of sticks of timber into the interior of the church; and, from the modes of expression, the reader may perhaps infer that there were several distinct outrages of these kinds. The fact, however, as we have learned from a credible witness, a candid and truthful man, who has the care of the house, is simply this; one piece of slitwork was thrust through a blind that was shut, and through the window into the house, and was supposed to have been done by a set of rowdies, older or younger, during the night; a supposition supported by the fact that, on the following morning, he found a broken rum-bottle on the steps of the church.

As to flooding the house by an engine, we would

only say that, from a variety of testimonies, on which we place some reliance, it appears that the deed was perpetrated by several young men, among whom are expressly named three sons of Orthodox parents, who attend the Orthodox meeting when they go to any, and one of these, it is affirmed, directed the pipe of the engine. However this may be, we have undeniable testimony that, when two women, who habitually attend our worship, were on a call at the house of friends, the bits were taken out of the mouth of the horse in their carriage, to the great peril of their limbs, if not their lives; that, on a call at another time and place, the reins were cut, and that spikes were driven into a log belonging to the same family, and intended for the mill, whereby a valuable saw, as well as the log, was nearly ruined; and we believe we have as undeniable evidence that all these things were done by one or more Orthodox boys, as Mr. I. has that *any one* of the outrages mentioned in his note, excepting those which may have occurred in his own presence, was perpetrated by any member of our Society.

Thus much for our defense.

In conclusion, we beg leave to remark that some of us are now on the verge of seventy and eighty years, and have had considerable opportunities for seeing and tasting those fruits, by which, according to the direction of our Saviour, we are to judge our fellow-men, so far as it is needful to judge them at all; and that we have come to the deliberate conclusion that there are many men and women among Unitarians, and perhaps as many or more among the Orthodox, who in the grand essentials of religion differ not more from one another,

than the northern and southern branches of the same vine. Which denomination is on the sunny, and which on the shady side of our spiritual vine, or on which side, in all the vicissitudes of seasons, the branches are generally most fruitful and fair, we have no disposition to say; for whatever others may think, say, or do to the contrary, *we* think it best to leave the decision of comparative merit and demerit to a more competent and a more disinterested and impartial judge, than any of us on either side can reasonably suppose ourselves to be.

In behalf of the Committee.

SAMUEL WILLARD, Chairman.

Deerfield, August 27, 1855.

---

Our defense was not allowed a place in the paper in which, as we think, we had been most unjustly accused of outrages, from which every feeling of our hearts would revolt; but as a substitute for our communication, the readers of that paper have the following editorial for Sept. 14th:

"THINGS IN DEERFIELD."

"In our paper of August 3d, we briefly noticed a Sermon which had been sent us, from the pen of Rev. A. E. Ives, preached by him at the conclusion of his ministry in Deerfield, and copied a note appended to it, in which charges of the most unhandsome and unchristianlike conduct were made by him against the enemies of Orthodoxy there. From the general tenor of the note, we inferred that he held the Unitarian body in that town, as responsible for that conduct, and so stated, though we know nothing personally of the facts. We have received a communication from a high and respected source, which assures us that Mr. Ives was mistaken in his idea, that these outrages were committed by, or received the sanction of the Unitarian body in Deerfield, and that he has (no doubt unintentionally) overstated their number and exaggerated their importance. Our informants regret that the mischief-making of irresponsible rowdies and ungovernable boys, should be laid to the charge of a body of Christians, who deplore them as sincerely as Mr. Ives himself."

The editors do not tell their readers why we were not permitted to vindicate ourselves before the same tribunal, before which we had been so grievously accused; nor indeed can we see any clear intimation that the communication was sent them for the purpose of publication. In a letter to the Chairman, however, they say of the communication: "We find that it would make three columns or more, and our columns are so crowded this week, and will continue so much so for some weeks to come, as to make it quite impossible for us to find room for the article. We regret this the less, as it seems to us, that we can accomplish the same object by the publication of a single explanatory paragraph, which we shall do in our paper of this week."

Before we have done with the subject, we expect to show that the explanatory paragraph is a very poor substitute for our communication, and that the wrong done us by Mr. Ives, to which the editors have made themselves accessory, is so great, that not only three columns, but three *pages* should have been promptly granted, if necessary to a complete reparation of the wrong. We had anticipated the possibility of such an objection, and to avoid it, we not only endeavored to condense our facts and arguments, as much as could be done without impairing the effect; but we had wholly omitted many things of material importance to a full view of the subject, such as the following:

When the Orthodox were building their church, men in our parish united with them in raising the frame, and that with the same activity and cheerfulness, which was apparent in those who were more nearly concerned.

So far as we have learned, there has been for these twenty years as much of peace and harmony between neighbors belonging to the different Societies, as there has been between those of the same Society; as much readiness to aid in time of need, and to exchange common civilities. We do not recollect a single instance of *litigation*, nor more than *one angry dispute* between members of the different Societies.

To account for the disorders and injuries which are said to have occurred about the place of worship, it is important to observe that the principal walk to and from the academy, passes immediately by the steps of the Church, which afford convenient seats for young persons, who on that account are likely to collect there; and as the steps were old, the curiosity which is a characteristic of the young might lead them to try the strength of the nails, and thus hasten the ruin of the steps; just as many of us have had our decayed railing or fences broken down, when they would otherwise have stood much longer. As to the bell-ropes said to have been cut and stolen, perhaps they too were old or otherwise defective, and were broken by boys and girls from Deerfield or other places, who were in the habit of seizing the rope and ringing the bell as they passed to and from the academy; the bell being for a time hung on the horse-shed, and the rope of course accessible to all. The disturbances of public worship may, we suppose, be accounted for much in the same way. Those assemblies were probably held in the evening, at the time and place where they were exposed to the noisy sport of boys, some of whom were impious enough to offer direct insults to the God of Heaven.

We too have frequently been annoyed in a similar way, if not to the same degree, in our meetings for the practice of sacred music, in the evening lectures, and in almost every kind of meeting.

As to the destruction of the trees, it is sufficient to state, that the first Unitarian minister headed a company of his parishioners, and spent the greater part of two days in procuring and planting the greater part of that avenue of trees, which for forty years has been the pride of Deerfield and the charm of travelers; and now there is no one so likely, as we, to have destroyed the like ornaments in a conspicuous place, where they are as indispensable to the symmetrical beauty of the street as they are to the comfort of the worshippers!!!

To return to the editorial, at first sight it may seem to be something like an acknowledgment of the wrong of which we complain; but on a closer examination we find no expression of regret for the part which the editors have taken in this matter, nor indeed for that of Mr. Ives, excepting what is put into the mouths of the "informants," nor is there any evidence that the *editors* are *convinced* of the injustice of those accusations, excepting the respect they pay to the authors of the communication, and the ambiguous word "assures," while Mr. Ives' conduct seems to be palliated into so slight an offense, as to leave the allegations to the probability of being *reiterated* from a *multitude* of pulpits far beyond the circulation of the pamphlet or the paper. If however we were to consult our own feelings alone, and our reputation were the only thing concerned, we should close this communication where we are; but as we would prove ourselves faithful subjects of Christ's

kingdom, we think ourselves bound to remonstrate most solemnly against such a lamentable abuse of the pulpit and the religious press, as we have now before us; an abuse no less common, than deplorable. To do this, we are under the painful necessity of dealing with the editors of the Congregationalist, as well as Mr. Ives, with a degree of plainness and rigor, to which we are not accustomed.

The editors say, in their explanatory paragraph: "From the general tenor of the note, we inferred that he held the Unitarian body in that town as responsible for that conduct, and so stated, though we knew nothing personally of the facts." In their letter they say, "we took it for granted that Mr. Ives would not state grave matters of that sort in so public a manner, unless he was prepared to prove his words." We would affectionately ask, *Who made this enormous grant*, by which editors of a religious paper are warranted on the bare assertion of an individual in giving currency to a host of accusations, which, so far as they are believed, must have the effect of blasting the reputation of a whole community of professed Christians; especially when it is apparent from the matter and style of the accusations, that the author was, from some cause or other, in a state of mind which would give him no claim to full confidence? And why did not the editors take time to consider, whether there was the slightest probability, that these charges could be substantiated in the sense and the extent in which they were understood? We think that a few moments would show a philosophic mind, that such proof would, in regard to most of the charges, be in the nature of things impossible. And

the editors not only publish the accusations, but say: "The tone of this farewell discourse is faithful and judicious," evidently intending to include the note. And further, they speak of some of the accusations as unquestionable truths; "some of its incidental revelations of facts," say they, "are worthy of being widely circulated, in token that the age of religious persecution has not gone wholly by, and that 'Liberal' Christians can be as illiberal and persistently ungenerous and harsh, as any body ever was. Read the note."

For the sake of brevity in our communication, we passed in silence almost the whole of the sermon, and some of the most objectionable parts of the note. We shall now bring a few specimens into view, that the reader may see how "faithful and judicious" they are.

First, we would bring to view those passages in which we are charged with inculcating *fundamental errors* and *untruths*, the *natural effects* of which are these very outrages, of which we are accused. In the note this is hypothetically suggested, and in the sermon, page 4th, Mr. Ives, in stating the reason of his coming to labor in Deerfield, says: "The firmer establishment and the upbuilding here of the church of Christ, and an influence for good on those who reject fundamental gospel truths, if possible, gaining them back to the faith they have forsaken, seemed to commend this as a field of labor. And now, these labors being about to close, as my knowledge of the condition and wants of this church and people is more perfect, and having had closer observation of the effect of erroneous doctrine in a community, of the prospect of recovering here to the truth those who have renounced it, and of the spirit

with which efforts for this end are met; I would urge the exhortation of Paul," &c. In page 11, he says with reference to our Society: "Some from earliest years have been trained to hate and despise the truth; have been taught that false doctrine is true, and that the truth of God is false." Once more, page 10: "When they propose compromise, offering to go with you to worship, on condition that you in return go with them, remember that there is no equality between the two things. If they attend worship with you and hear the truth, that is one thing, and is very well. If you go with them and listen to error, and thereby give it countenance, that is another thing, and is not well. He who offers to take a healthy beverage on condition that you swallow poison, proposes things very unequal."

How does Mr. Ives know what doctrines have been inculcated from our pulpit for the last forty-eight years? Does he confide in those floating rumors, which are proverbially false and full of mischief? Or does he infer that because this or that individual under the name of Unitarian, has advanced dangerous errors, therefore these same errors are undoubtedly taught in every Unitarian church, and consequently in that of Deerfield? From *our own consciousness* and the testimony of *our own ears*, we can give here a little information on this subject, which will enable him and others to judge somewhat more safely, what has been the *moral* tendency of the doctrines delivered from our pulpit since 1807.

The first Unitarian minister of Deerfield was the settled pastor of the town and parish precisely twenty-two years, and first and last he has supplied the pulpit

about twenty-three years. Among the principal subjects of his preaching were the infinite perfections of God, and the solemn and affecting relations He bears to *us*, and we to *Him;* the inspiration and paramount authority of the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; the two great commands on which hang all the law and the prophets; the *supremacy* of the Divine Law and its binding force upon all our thoughts and feelings, as well as upon all our actions in all the relations of life; the apostasy of mankind from God, and the ruinous state of the world in consequence of sin, the greatest of evils and the source of all our woes; the necessity of some higher power, than that of man, to redeem and save us from this state of ruin; "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only name given among men whereby we must be saved, who is able to save to the uttermost all who come to God by Him;" a real and proper atonement through the mediation of Christ, though not effected in the same way that is stated in the Assembly's Catechism; salvation, not an *outward gift*, but an effect wrought on the soul itself by the infusion of a true and spiritual life; holiness of heart and life indispensable to any true happiness here, as well as hereafter; a holiness to be derived from intimate and habitual communion with God, or, which is virtually the same thing, such a vital union with Christ as is fitly represented by the connection between the vine and its branches; and the personal presence of Christ with every true disciple in every age and country, according to the literal import of Matthew 28 : 20.

These general subjects, with their various ramifications, were, as already said, the burden of preaching in

our pulpit for the first twenty-two years; and it was seldom that anything was said against the Calvinistic creed, while it may be doubted whether there was *ever* any opposition, greater than that which now exists between the *New* and the *Old* School. What is here said of our pulpit for the first twenty-two years, may with few or no exceptions be affirmed of its present ministrations. Among other things, the *spirituality* of all true religion, and the insufficiency of all outward service and all external virtues, which do not flow from a pious heart; the duty and the privilege of habitual prayer, and the necessity of a close walk with God, and a *vital union* with Christ in order to eternal life, are frequently urged, not only by the pastor, but by those with whom he exchanges. The like, we believe, may be asserted in regard to many, if not most of the Unitarian pulpits in New England.

We now put the question to Mr. Ives, Are these doctrines fundamental errors and untruths? Is the natural tendency of them to produce all manner of wickedness? And are these effects such necessary results, as to require no other evidence, that we have committed the outrages, of which he complains, than the fact that we inculcate these doctrines? Can Mr. Ives say these things without the fearful hazard of blaspheming against the Holy Ghost? And will the Congregationalist uphold him in all this?

Let those who would judge correctly of the effect of our doctrines on the mind and the heart, in life and death, read some of our biographies; such, for instance, as those of John E. Abbot, Nathan Parker, and Noah Worcester, by Henry Ware, Jun.; that of Joseph

Tuckerman, by William E. Channing; of William E. Channing, by William H. Channing; that of Henry Ware, Jun., by John Ware; and that of Charles Follen, by his widow; and let them be sure to read the life and character of Mary L. Pickard, afterward Mrs. Henry Ware, by Edward B. Hall, and then doubt, if they must, whether those mingling clusters of meek and more than heroic virtues, which were the productions of her early, as well as her later years, derived their richness and beauty from an immortal union with the "*True Vine.*"

Secondly, we shall bring into view some of those passages in the sermon and note, in which we are virtually, if not expressly, charged with *hypocrisy, deceit, selfish policy, and neglect of common decency.* In page 9th, we read: "If, then, error take on a specious form, evidently endeavoring sometimes in language to come very near you; perhaps, in such circumstances, it might seem that no watchfulness was really needful; that the greater the speciousness, the more evident the hollowness; that one distinctly denying the truth at one time and laboriously assuming the appearance of believing it at another, could at least but forfeit the claim to moral honesty. When, therefore, they profess to you to believe that Christ is divine, that he died for us, that faith in him is necessary, that man needs to be born again, that sin is to be punished hereafter, then watch and discriminate. Understand well that this representation to you, and the use of phraseology on these subjects such as you employ, *has some object in view.* For on these points they deny, or do not hold, what you believe. Their "divine," as applied to Christ, their atonement, their faith, their regeneration, their future

punishment — these, as held by them, though in the spirit of strange ethics couched sometimes in the same language, are not the doctrines you receive from the Bible. Be the more suspicious, and the more carefully avoid them, when they attempt to beguile you by a show of soundness, covering over error, for a purpose, with evangelical terms. When the belief of error, in its evident and proper form, is honestly avowed, professing to be simply what it is, as we sometimes find it, then, though we esteem the error none the less, we find it more easy to entertain respect." After a torrent of accusations in the note, the author says: "At times, it may be felt, that the matter has been carried a little farther than policy would dictate," and adds, "this course of treatment has been unprovoked, and has been borne quietly and patiently, with the hope that decency, if not better principle, might prevail."

On these passages we have no comments to make; but leaving it to the reader to form his own opinion of them, we would simply ask the Congregationalist whether the tone of them is indeed "faithful and judicious;" and Mr. Ives, whether he really knows "what manner of spirit he is of."

Thirdly, we proceed to notice a few characteristics, which to our dim and perhaps distorted vision, appear too indicative of an assuming, all-knowing, and unseemly spirit. In page 6, the author tells his hearers: "Your position is a testimony for Christ, is a standing protest against the denial of the faith; your turning aside from the assembly of those who have forsaken the truth, the sight of you every Sabbath-day walking to your own separate place of worship, is an act of honor to

the Lord Jesus." On page 7, he says: "A Methodist, a Baptist, a consistent Episcopalian, you may bid God-speed; he stands with you on the foundation of the gospel. But one denying the truths which these denominations hold, you are bound in meekness to reprove; you cannot bid him God-speed in his departures from Christ."

Mr. Ives undertakes to give, page 10, the statistics of piety and prayer in the first Society in Deerfield, and says, among other things, "Social prayer is unheard of, and family altars are nearly all broken down." Does he mean to have his readers believe that there are no assembles on the Lord's day for the purpose of prayer, in imitation of the early Christians? What is that but social prayer of the highest order? Or will he undertake to say no prayers are offered in the weekly meetings, held at the house of the pastor? As to the family altar, we regret that it has been allowed to fall into ruin in so many families, as we apprehend may be the fact. Perhaps, however, there may be more of family worship among us than is supposed. There have been those who had these exercises in *private* rooms, and it may be that "He, who seeth in secret," knoweth instances of that kind, which are unknown to us. Still, we suppose it probable that the Orthodox are more attentive to the outward form of prayer than Unitarians are; but to determine their comparative merit, two questions are to be answered—first, Do they pray? and secondly, Are their temper and conduct toward their fellow-men such as to render their prayers acceptable to God? There is a passage of Scripture, Psalm 15: 1, 3, which we think will afford some aid in

answering the second question: "Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor." Another passage of like import is found in Matthew 5: 23, 24— "If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." The conclusion we draw from these passages, will, we think, be greatly strengthened by a reference to Matthew 6: 15 — "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." If, to render our prayers availing, we must forgive those who have done us wrong, how can it be imagined that we shall be heard in Heaven, if we *do* wrong and refuse, or neglect to make reparation?

We might animadvert on other objectionable things in the sermon; but we are weary of this review, and shall pursue it no farther, while we repeat, that in what we have said, we are conscious of no unfriendly feeling toward Mr. Ives, or the editors of the Congregationalist; but, on the other hand, are conscious of tender feelings for both. We have had *an object in view*, which we think important to the vital interests of Christ's kingdom; the success of that blessed religion, which every true disciple of Jesus will think dearer than life or reputation.

The adventurous spirit of Mr. Ives, and the countenance he received from the Congregationalist, have given us a *rare opportunity*, and most effectual *means* of bringing into a full and distinct view a *prevalent* evil, of

whose length, and breadth, and depth, few seem to have any conception. We refer to the treatment, which for forty long years Unitarians have *generally* received from their Orthodox brethren. God forbid that we should "render evil for evil, or railing for railing;" that we should pass severe judgments on others, because they pass them on us; but in that spirit of humility and forbearance, which becomes every disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus, we would put to our Orthodox brethren, both clergy and laity, a few simple questions, requesting of them explicit answers.

Are not the Unitarians a "sect everywhere spoken against?"

Are they not represented, as *apostates* from "the truth as it is in Jesus;" so corrupt in faith, if not in morals, as to be unworthy of the Christian name? And are not the people warned, again and again, against attending their preaching or reading their publications? Has not our condition been very like that of Paul — Acts 25: 7 and 8 — except that *we* have had no one in authority so fair and impartial as even Festus was, to secure to us the right of being heard in our own defense?

Have we not, indeed, been treated in this respect very much like the *colored people* in our *land*, whose testimony is excluded by the laws of many States from courts of justice, however indispensable to their security from the greatest abuses?

The facts implied in these queries are, we believe, so frequent, so general, and so notorious, that few, if any, will deny them. We do not say that *all* the Orthodox are chargeable with any such unfairness. There are

*some*, we hope there are *many*, among them, who in these things differ as much from many others, as the Jews of Berea — Acts 17 — differed from those of Thessalonica.

The two first pastors of the Orthodox Church in our village we delight to honor for their ingenuous spirit, and the conduct of those who led in the devotional parts of the induction of Dr. Huntington into his Professorship in Harvard College, was cheering to our hearts, as an example of liberality, which we hope will have an influence on many others. Still, we believe these are exceptions to general facts. The prejudices against us we know to be strong in almost every part of our country, from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains, — so strong that many who have almost shuddered at the name Unitarian, on being acquainted with the doctrines we really hold and teach, have found, to their surprise, that they were *themselves* Unitarians, and always had been so. With better information, we apprehend, this would be a general fact with those who, from religious principle, and not from secular motives, now take their stand on the side of Orthodoxy.

Why is it that people are to be thus frightened away from all communion with Unitarians? What have we done to deserve this excision from the Church of Christ? Two nominal reasons are given, why we should be avoided; first, we do not preach *all* the *doctrines* which are insisted on by the Orthodox; and second, that we *pervert* the Scriptures to the support of false doctrines.

In reply to the first of these charges, our apology is, that we do not find these doctrines, as they are professedly held, *clearly revealed* in the word of God; and

fearing that we should be "wise above what is written," we think it safest to leave those things till we have more light; especially when we read, as we do, Deut. 29th, 29th: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed, belong unto us and to our children for ever; that we may do all the words of this law." We are confirmed in the correctness of our course in the matter we are considering, by the reason here given for the revelation: "*That we may do all the words of this law.*" It is not easy to conceive how secret things, or those of which we have little or no apprehension, can have much influence on the conscience, or the life, or how it can be more profitable to dwell on these dark points, than to urge those great principles of duty to God and man, which are clearly revealed, and which may be brought into close contact with the understanding and the moral sense.

In answer to the second charge, viz., that of perverting the Scriptures to the support of false doctrine, we would say, that, although it might be tolerated in the Pope of Rome, it comes with an ill grace from Protestant lips. The amount of it is, that we read and interpret the Scriptures for ourselves; that we go immediately to *Jesus* for instruction, instead of going to *them* to inquire what his teachings are. If they think our interpretations wrong, let them expose the errors by clear and candid reasoning from the Scriptures themselves; and let them not treat us as the Jews did the man who had been cured of his native blindness, when they could not otherwise meet his arguments, John 9: 30, 34. They answered and said unto him, "Thou wast altogether born in sin, and dost thou teach us? and they cast him out."

By Divine *grace* we think we have a right to some lowly place in the house of God, and the family of Jesus. We claim to be brethren and fellow-servants of the Orthodox; *weak* brethren, it may be, too unprofitable servants of the Lord Jesus, alas, we know; but still we are so conscious of sincerity, that we may say to Him, in the words of Peter, "Thou knowest that we love Thee." He who once apologized so tenderly for his slumbering disciples, in the words, "the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak," will, we humbly hope, bear with us in all our defects; and why should not our brethren do the same? If they have already a clear and full vision of the mysterious truths of God, why will they not give us a look through their blessed glass, instead of the dark one, through which we have hitherto been accustomed to look? We would not be so inconsistent as to urge their fulfilling to us the apostolic injunction, "In lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than themselves;" but granting that they *are holier* than we, we would ask, Why should they not allow us to come and sit near them, where we may feel the sanctifying influence of their presence on our souls, while by the grace of our common Master, we in return may possibly be of some little benefit to them?

As we humbly conceive, the disciples of Jesus have something better to do, than that of striving, one party with another, for the exclusive possession of the Christian synagogue. It is emphatically their commission to *cast out devils*, as we learn from the remarkable climax, Matthew 10: 8 — "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils." It was *not* the *peculiar*

commission *of the apostles* and early Christians to cast out devils. There are devils enough in the breasts of men at the *present* day, to absorb the attention and employ all the holy energies of every true disciple, and leave him no time to hinder his brethren in this great work, and no disposition to forbid their doing it in their own way, while they do it in the name of Jesus. That selfishness which characterises, in a greater or less degree, almost every human being, is *the prince of devils*, having under him an innumerable host of his own offspring, as various in form and size, as the vices and sins of the world, inspiring in all ages all war and slavery and oppression, and those brutal pleasures which degrade and starve the soul. This selfishness is one of those spirits which "go not forth but by prayer and fasting;" sincere prayer, and that kind of fasting which consists not in abstinence from *food*, but from all indulgence of selfish feelings in our hearts, in order that we may cast them out of the hearts of others.

When will the disciples of Jesus learn this great truth? When will the tree of life, which the Lord Jesus planted on the earth eighteen hundred years ago, whose *very leaves* were for the healing of the nations, be allowed to grow and spread its branches over the whole of our wretched world? How long — how many centuries or *thousands* of years before an end is put to insane wars, to that indolence and luxury which feed themselves on the flesh and blood, yea, the very souls of human beings? to those unholy gains which are acquired by violence or fraud, and to those low pleasures which leave to man nothing but the wreck of his earthly form? "Is there no balm in Gilead, and no physician there?"

Blessed be God, there *is more* balm in the Gospel for the *souls* of men, than was ever found in Gilead for the cure of their *physical* woes. Our own eyes see this immortal balm, and our own souls, we think, have *felt* something of its healing power. From a close inspection into the essence of the Gospel, we believe, or rather *we know*, it *is* and must be "the wisdom of God and the power of God" for salvation to every one, who gives it a cordial and full reception. From the evident tendency of its great principles, as well as from the promise of the Almighty, we believe it will finally triumph over the inveterate corruptions of the world. The Lord Jesus will sit at the right hand of God, till the last foe is brought to submission; but when will this glorious consummation take place? Oh that we might hear the annunciation from Heaven, "Behold I come quickly;" quickly, not as it appears to that Infinite Mind, to which "a thousand years are as one day," but as the word is used in our small calculations! From the eager yearnings of our heart and soul we would respond, "Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus!"

Come, thou blessed One, in all the majesty and mercy of the Father, not to destroy men's lives, not to burn up the world with all its sinful inhabitants, but to save it from all its corruptions and woes! Come, and teach thy disciples what their religion means, inspiring them with that divine love, which, according to thy prayer, will make them all *one*, even as thou and their blessed Father are one! Come, and breathe upon all who profess thy name, and say with an almighty efficiency, "receive ye the Holy Ghost," that we may fulfill the high commission, "whosesoever sins ye remit, they are

remitted," not by words of absolution, not chiefly by the letter of divine truth, but by the purifying influence of that divine life, which we derive from thee, and which is to be transfused from soul to soul, till sin is banished from the earth, and thy last foe is brought to a blissful submission, and "great voices" shall be heard in Heaven, saying, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ." Amen. Amen. "Even so, come Lord Jesus!"

In behalf of the Committee.

SAMUEL WILLARD, Chairman.

Sept. 28.

A

# BRIEF EXAMINATION

OF THE

"AFFECTIONATE REMONSTRANCE"

OF

# THE DEERFIELD COMMITTEE.

BY

ALFRED E. IVES,

Recent Pastor in Deerfield, Mass.

---

BOSTON:
PRESS OF CROCKER AND BREWSTER,
47, Washington-Street.
1856.

# BRIEF EXAMINATION.

A Farewell Discourse, preached at Deerfield, Mass., April 29, 1855, and soon after published with the addition of a Note, has called forth, within the present year, 1856, an "Affectionate Remonstrance" in reply, from Rev. Samuel Willard, D. D., acting as Chairman of a Committee appointed for that purpose.

This reply is a somewhat remarkable pamphlet,—especially remarkable as an *affectionate* remonstrance. Professing much kind feeling, it abounds in personal insinuation and accusation. Claiming that the writer of the obnoxious sermon was laboring under a mental disease and clearly not entitled to credence, it yet labors to extenuate and soften down what he has alleged as facts. In general denying the allegations of the sermon and note, and formally attempting to refute them, it yet either directly or virtually admits them as true, with trifling exception. While admitting generally the truth of the accusations, it continually represents the writer of the sermon as untruthful and calumnious in giving them utterance. Engaged to shield its party from the responsibility of the outrages, and earnestly endeavoring to do so, it yet maintains the absolute impossibility that they could be proved to be obnoxious to the charge of persecution. Laboring to escape the imputation of being persecutors, it claims, on the other hand, that the Unitarians throughout the land, for forty years, have been the persecuted party—while yet they believe that the honest portion of the Orthodox are themselves generally, and always have been, really Unitarians, though either too ignorant to know it or too fearful to avow it.

But while compelled to admit that the Orthodox community in Deerfield have been subjected to these outrages, and laboring to shield themselves from all responsibility, it is remarkable that this Committee express no regret for these wrongs, nor sympathy for those so injured; while they seek excuses and precedents for the perpetrators, and labor to extenuate the outrages, and even add gross injury to those whom they claim not to have wronged. There is running through the pamphlet a vein, but partially concealed, of satisfaction with the outrages as well deserved, and a strong current of evident hostility towards the Orthodox. The "*affection*" of this remonstrance, even while disclaiming all responsibility for the wrong done, reminds us of Joab, addressing Amasa with words of kindness,—Art thou in health, my brother?—while he thrust a sword into his bowels. Yet the pamphlet closes with a pious aspiration for peace!

Certain parts of the pamphlet give evidence that the better judgment of the Chairman of the Committee was overruled; they bear an image and superscription foreign to his wonted manliness and sagacity. It would be a matter of interest, in itself, thoroughly to examine this pamphlet; but as the subject matter is local, only a few points will be noticed, and they as briefly as possible.

1. Insanity of the author.—The Committee, impelled by charity, profess to believe that the writer of the sermon was really crazy. Their dilemma is this: if they believe the assertion, they have labored for months, and printed a pamphlet of forty pages, to repel the charges of evident insanity. "After whom dost thou pursue? After a dead dog; after a flea." If they do not believe it, they have simply asserted what they believe to be untrue. Either their manliness or their morality must suffer. The necessities must have been felt to be urgent, and the case desperate, that could impel to so reckless a charge.

2. Correction.—The assertions of the sermon and note respecting the injuries received by the Orthodox community in Deerfield, referred to a part only of many more facts of like nature which might have been enumerated. Many of these facts were known to the writer; some were stated on the testimony

of others. It would have been unexampled, however if no rebutting testimony, as to the truth of some of the charges, (even when true,) could be found by an interested and industrious Committee. And it is remarkable, that laboring for that object, with every facility for investigation, at the end of eight months after the delivery of the sermon, there is but *one* point, of the many involved, to which they attempt to bring evidence for correction; and this only goes to show that the charge should have been in the singular number, and not in the plural. They admit indignities to have been cast on one Pastor in the public streets. The note stated that more than one had been the subject of abuse. I can adduce testimony to prove this assertion; and that there was dissatisfaction, at the time, with that part of Rev. Mr. Belden's discourse, which alluded to this matter, by those who regarded the treatment to which he had been subjected as not always respectful and kind. It would be easy to show that these Pastors were the subjects of various injury,—of ridicule, of detraction, of abuse —injury of which they might or might not be cognizant, but which others knew. The Orthodox community in Deerfield can bear testimony on this subject, as their neighbors well know. But I am not disposed to urge this. I design now *to rest the case on the very admissions, direct or tacit, of this Committee.* They have done their utmost, and all their testimony can do is to strike off the letter *s*, after the word Pastor. They have not even attempted to disprove any other charge. They have labored industriously and long, but they have not succeeded in bringing one item of testimony against any one of the other many charges against them. They labor hard to conceal this fact, but the fact stands out—*they have been unable to disprove the charges*—they do not even make the attempt.

3. Admissions, direct or tacit.—The Committee appointed expressly to investigate the case, report through their Chairman, confessing in general that the Unitarians in Deerfield have not avoided every thing wrong, nor done every thing which might justly be expected, in their treatment of the Orthodox; particularly, they admit indignities cast on a Pastor of the Orthodox church in the streets of Deerfield; they refer to the fact and do not deny that a school teacher was dis-

missed for attending a prayer-meeting; they admit injury to Dr. Trow; they admit the thrusting of timber through blind and window into the church; they admit the flooding of the church by an engine; they admit the tearing up of church steps; they admit the cutting and stealing of bell-ropes; they admit disturbances of public worship; they admit the girdling of shade trees around the church. They do not indeed confess themselves responsible for these acts, but they do, directly or tacitly, admit that the Orthodox have been subject to these abuses. The other specifications of the note they do not disprove nor deny. These outrages were so well known and so susceptible of proof, that the investigating Committee could not deny them.—Let it not then hereafter be said, that these things are untrue, or that the evidence of them rests only on the assertions of the Orthodox. A Unitarian Committee, appointed for the purpose, and investigating the charges, and laboring hard to extenuate and obscure the facts, have been obliged to admit them.

4. Misrepresentations.—Dr. Willard may have been misinformed, but he has not stated the case truly in reference to a new physician. It is not true that any but fair and honorable and truthful means were used in the introduction of Dr. Trow. It is not true that Dr. Trow was invited *after* another physician had been introduced to come and enter into competition with him. It is true that another physician came in, not so far as I know by invitation, after Dr. Trow had been invited and had consented to come to Deerfield. Dr. T. was invited and had arranged to come *previously*, and endeavored to negotiate with Dr. Williams, who had advertised for a successor. Dr. W. refused to negotiate with him, and was informed that Dr. T., notwithstanding, would come on the invitation: I so informed him myself, and was told by him that he had not then arranged with any one to succeed him. Another physician was thereupon, with apparent haste, introduced by him—one claiming to be, and published to the world as being, regularly educated and graduated in the medical profession,—which was not true. This false pretension, together with the information we derived concerning him from abroad, and our observation of what seemed to us the very

marked want of skill and success in certain "critical cases," (in which conclusions we were sustained by the opinion of competent medical men,)—these things satisfied us that though Dr. Trow was not yet on the ground, and though the practice was insufficient for two physicians, it was still advisable for him to come; believing, as we did, that his professional advantages and his rare qualities as a man and a Christian, could not fail, in the circumstances, to secure the support of the community. The event was an "entire failure:" the failure, however, was that of those who were like the heath in the desert, not knowing when good cometh. We had formed a higher opinion of a portion of the community than facts warranted.—Dr. Trow had a fair share of practice, probably his full proportion. But such a torrent of falsehood and abuse was turned upon him—so effectually roused and arrayed against him were all the old prejudices against Orthodoxy—so excessive was the bitterness—so wide the apparently judicial blindness—that we could not think it his duty, urged as he was to enter more desirable fields, to remain, with the hope of eventually wearing out a feeling that professed a willingness rather to die in other hands than live under his.

It is not true that the steps of the church, so repeatedly torn up, were old; nor that the stolen bell-ropes were old.

The parents of three of the young men engaged in the engine affair are said to "attend the Orthodox church, when they go to any." It would be more to the point, to tell us where those young men attend church, and under what prevailing influences they are in society. It is significant that this Committee know all about these young men: I have made inquiry and cannot learn who they are.

I believe in the proverb "like priest like people," but my "logic" fails me in following to the conclusion, that because Dr. Willard, a Unitarian clergyman, was once active, yea, headed a company, for planting trees in Deerfield street, when Orthodoxy was unknown there, therefore the girdling of trees around the Orthodox church, forty years afterwards, was not prompted by ill will toward the Orthodox cause. It is a reasonable conclusion, however, that the Committee gave the best representation of the matter that they could.

5. Raising a dust.—The Remonstrance has a "more summary and more satisfactory" way of disposing of the alleged facts than disproving them. Thus: before they can be regarded as persecutors, it must, say they, be proved that what is alleged was committed; that it was by a member of their society; that it was generally approved by them; and that it flowed from a spirit of persecution. Until all this is proved, they are secure against the charge of persecution. But such proof, they say, is impossible by any thing short of omniscience. Therefore it is impossible to prove that the Orthodox in Deerfield have been persecuted by the Unitarians. This clearly seemed very ingenious and very profound to the Committee, but as evidently it did not satisfy them; they do not rest at all upon it; for before resorting to it they first attempt to lesson confidence in the assertions of the sermon by claiming that the writer was really crazy, and then bring all the evidence they can find to disprove his statements. Having done all they could in this way, they attempt to raise a dust to hide the weakness of all their remaining efforts to set aside the truth—even that truth which they are yet compelled to admit.

Now if the Unitarians in Deerfield suppose that whatever they have done, and whatever they may do, will be incapable of proof, as showing persecution, till subjected to this ordeal, they may be assured that at the bar of public opinion the process has been, and will be, far more summary. And it is a matter to be distinctly noted, as not without meaning, that this Committee, with Dr. Willard at their head, have endeavored, behind such a defence, to shield the state of things in Deerfield from public judgment, and to forestall public opinion. It must have been a pressing urgency that called for so hazardous an undertaking.—Have the persecuting party, in time past, been taught to regard themselves, in all they have done, as shielded behind such a screen? Has Dr. Willard held and taught this doctrine formerly?

6. Calumnious charges.—It might have been supposed that in an *affectionate* remonstrance there would have been an absence of all hard charges against others—that where an attempt to disprove the specifications of the sermon had so

signally failed, the author would have been spared. The Committee judged otherwise. Perhaps in their vexation and embarrassment there is some excuse for them. Perhaps the exposure of the wrong doings at Deerfield was a provocation so serious that we ought to expect crimination even in an "affectionate" reply. We will therefore let that pass.

Dr. Willard admits and regrets the falling to ruin so extensively among them of the family altar. (What he says of social prayer shows that while meetings with them for that purpose are unknown, even he seems not to understand what is really meant by distinctive *social* prayer.) He admits that the Orthodox are more attentive than the Unitarians to the "outward form of prayer." Could it be believed that in his affectionate epistle, while admitting that a portion of the community were more engaged in seeming prayer—kneeling with their households every day at their domestic altars—not forsaking the assembling of themselves together, as the manner of some is, but often meeting for social prayer—could it be believed that Dr. Willard would here raise the question concerning them, "Do they *pray?*"—that he would question their right state of heart in prayer, and accuse them as backbiters and abusers of others—implying that their prayers were mere hypocritical forms? O vaunted charity! O boasted liberality! how art thou fallen!—It is such a spirit as is here exhibited, and which, in circumstances of less restraint, must be often manifest, that is responsible for the outrages complained of.

But this is not all: he declares it to be notorious, that for forty long years the Unitarians have generally been subjects of great injustice from the Orthodox; that in respect to being heard and judged fairly, they have been treated "like the colored people, whose testimony in some States is excluded from courts." Now it is a notorious fact that for forty long years the theological world has been made to ring with the clamor of the Unitarians; their publications have flooded the land. And yet because the religious world will still regard them as dangerous errorists, and reject their dogmas of negation, they complain of being abused. Doubtless this result has been a grievous disappointment to the sanguine expecta-

tions entertained by a few forty years ago. But it is a singular cause of complaint.

But more than this—Dr. Willard believes that those of "religious principle" among the Orthodox, with better information, would generally find that "they were themselves Unitarians and always had been." That is, those generally "who from religious principles now take their stand on the side of Orthodoxy," (the others of course are not there from religious principle,) do profess to believe fundamental doctrines which they do and always have believed to be false; while, for forty years, they have been greatly injuring and have been "frightened away" from those Unitarians with whom they were yet in sentiment agreed. The claim is not that all among the Orthodox are really Unitarians; only that portion of them who are distinguished by religious principle. With all becoming deference to the gray hairs of Dr. Willard, I would return the question which his affection has put to me, "Whether he really knows what manner of spirit he is of?"

7. "Faithful and judicious" tone of the sermon.—The sermon gave warning against error when taking on a specious form, and when covered over by a show of soundness with evangelical terms, etc. Since Dr. Willard has not chosen to pass this paragraph in silence, but especially to complain of it, I shall not decline the issue.

I suppose there is now and has been especial occasion in Deerfield, to heed just such counsel as this. I believe that in discourse and prayer, words and phrases, of established meaning among the Orthodox, have been used by Unitarians in such a manner that others would naturally suppose those so using them to hold doctrines which they do not believe—especially when these same Unitarians sometimes claim that there is no great difference between them and the Orthodox. I suppose there is a class connected with the Unitarians, but not really of them, who are in a condition to be influenced favorably towards Unitarianism by such representations. Not to speak of other manifest examples,—I have frequently heard Dr. Willard use language which of itself would lead me to regard him as holding doctrines which I knew he discarded; and I believe he is able to use language which will convey to

me ideas on these subjects which he holds and which I do not. Dr. Willard will not shrink from declaring himself a Unitarian, though I am happy to believe that his separation from the Orthodox is less wide than that of many with whom he is connected—notwithstanding he seems to endorse the present teachings of his former pulpit. But is it not a fact, that many to whom he ministered when pastor of the first parish in Deerfield, did not believe him to be a Unitarian? Is it not a fact, that sometimes in discourse, but more in prayer, his language would often convey to Orthodox ears the fullest expression of distinctive Orthodox doctrine—even those doctrines which he does not believe? Is it not still true of him? Is it not morally certain that if, especially in the early days of his pastorate, he had clearly and fully made known his belief and unbelief of all the doctrines then in controversy in the Congregational churches in New England, either he would have lost his church, or many of his church and society would have forsaken him? Is it not true that many of his church who were then Orthodox, were unwilling to believe that he was not so also—that sometimes fear and sometimes hope as to his soundness existed—that many liked him as a man who had doubt of his doctrines—that they were gradually, imperceptibly—shall I say designedly—led off, some quite over to Unitarianism, some partly over, while others, a smaller number at the last, stood firm to the truth? Probably there was, on the part of some in the community, including certain men of reputed infidel sentiments and of strong dislike to Orthodoxy, a readiness to sustain him in error at the first; but I believe that a distinct avowal by him of Unitarianism and of his real belief then, would have saved Deerfield from not a little of its present degeneracy. He may deem it a good work effected by him, in leading off that church, whether or not he can justify the means. I believe that both the end and the means were wrong, and the result full of disaster to the eternal well being of many.

I have said of the Unitarian doctrines prevalent at Deerfield, "their *divine*, as applied to Christ, their atonement, their faith, their regeneration, their future punishment, are not the doctrines you receive from the Bible." Dr. Willard

quotes this as if an untrue statement. If he knows what the Orthodox belief on these points is, and knows what is taught among the Unitarians at Deerfield, I am utterly unable to see how he can adhere to this position; for I assert what I have either heard or read from themselves. Take the first doctrine specified: Does Dr. Willard pretend that Unitarians apply the term *divine* to Christ in the same sense that the Orthodox do? To pretend this would be an insult to the understandings of the community. If he will not pretend it, then his implied charge of misrepresentation herein is groundless. Or take the last doctrine specified, *future punishment:* it is openly and boldly taught in the Unitarian pulpit at Deerfield, that the wicked are not punished eternally—a fact of which the Committee are not ignorant.

This very effort of the Remonstrance to convey the idea that these doctrines are held and taught in their pulpit, as by the Orthodox, shows, that there is great occasion for the caution which I would repeat again with emphasis—Beware of those men, as religious teachers, who would convey the impression that they believe in essential doctrines which they do not believe. Beware of them, because they do not hold the truth. Beware of them, because they seek to convey the impression that they hold what in fact they reject.

8. Tendency of Unitarian doctrines.—Dr. Willard gives an enumeration of the leading doctrines which he has preached, and then propounds to me the question,—"Is the natural tendency of these to produce all manner of wickedness?"—such as has been perpetrated in Deerfield? Without dwelling on the fact that his phraseology, in the statement of some of his doctrines, would convey to unsuspecting Orthodox ears, very different ideas from the teachings of Dr. Willard, especially of his successors, on these points, I will answer his question.

Unregenerate human nature being totally depraved, the influence on that nature of a system of doctrines which denies that depravity, and which teaches to rely for salvation on a system in which the saving element is wanting; and which at the same time declares to be false and monstrous, and pours contempt on, that other system which maintains such depravity of nature, and the necessity of a corresponding

change in order to holiness, and an atonement for sin by the death of Jesus Christ; I believe the natural, the legitimate effect to be just such deportment toward those holding the Orthodox faith, as that which has been made the subject of complaint. Not teaching that the law condemns the sinner to eternal death—that he is by nature a child of wrath—that the natural heart is destitute of holiness—that the change in the heart must be as radical as this evil—that Christ died to make atonement for sin—and that faith must rely on him as such an atoning Savior, (not to refer to other things,) the leaving out of these doctrines—makes another system; and to bring in this other system, whatever truth it may embrace, in the place of the gospel, and to teach men to rely on it as the gospel;—to minister to weakness and pride by representing this as a new discovery, and an improvement on an old, traditional, worn-out system;—and at the same time to treat the gospel and those who hold it with hostility and contempt—this, in my estimation, is sowing the dragon's teeth which have sprung up in Deerfield. It is not simply the natural effect of the truth preached by Unitarians, but that truth as a substitute for something else, and in connection with essential error, and, as such a substitute, bearing on uncorrected human nature, and that nature taught to regard itself as far better than it is—it is this together that has produced its effects—effects naturally following such cause. Such a system of mingled truth and error, standing alone, would doubtless be followed by evil. But when taken instead of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and bearing on and falling in with the tendencies of the unrenewed heart, its effects would be far worse.—There is little occasion for complacency in the truths still taught in the Unitarian pulpit in Deerfield, while so radical doctrines are there denied, and so serious errors inculcated.

9. Unitarian Biographies.—These are appealed to as showing the effects of Unitarian teaching. Perhaps it is to my reproach; but, of the memoirs referred to, I have read only those of Dr. Channing and Mrs. Ware. It is to me an interesting fact, that the early lives and hopeful conversion of these two individuals were under Evangelical and not Unita-

rian influences. It would be a matter of interest to know how far this is true of the subjects of the other memoirs. I may be permitted to say of Dr. Channing, that he seems to me to have been a man of peculiar amiability and refinement of feeling, of finished scholarship and taste, but by no means the great man that Unitarians would have him to be, and certainly not peculiar for his Christ-like spirit—in one direction habitually far from it—habitually acrid, bitter and abusive. Would Dr. Willard commend the spirit commonly exhibited towards Orthodoxy by Dr. Channing in his writings, as eminently Christian? And furthermore I would inquire,—is it forgotten that his later life exhibited—not wholly suppressed even by his biographer—some yearnings of heart towards that Orthodoxy which had nurtured his youth, and from which he had apostatised?—I have sometimes witnessed what seemed a Christian spirit existing, apparently, not as a consequence of Unitarianism, but in despite of it.

10. The responsibility.—Who is responsible for the outrages to which the Orthodox have been subjected in Deerfield? Without doubt, Dr. Willard and this Committee, and many for whom they speak, sincerely regret many of these things. But I suppose these very individuals are largely responsible for them. That spirit which they cherish toward the Orthodox Society, which is so evident even in their guarded Remonstrance,—a document of careful preparation and long digestion, designed for public scrutiny,—and which in places crops out baldly even there—that spirit which no one living among them can fail very often to notice, even where there is much profession of kindness and many acts that seem to indicate kindness—a spirit which shows itself in looks, in words, in things done and things not done—it is this, constantly operating on the community, which, as I suppose, emboldens others to grosser actions. Except for this cherished and manifested spirit, I believe those outbreakings of hostility would be unknown. And I must deem them largely responsible for the result in whose cherished feelings the inciting cause is found.

11. The influence and bearing of the Remonstrance.—The wrong acts charged are in general virtually or directly admit-

ted by this Committee. They are injuries of a gross character, of great variety, and continued for years. They are injuries to which one part of the community are subjected, and from which the other are exempt. They are against a peaceable and unoffending Christian Church and Society. Does this Committee, with Rev. Dr. Willard at their head, pointedly condemn these outrages and rebuke the perpetrators? Do they express sorrow for the deeds and sympathy for the sufferers? Is there one word of reproof? Nay, they attempt to create the impression that what they cannot deny has not been done; or they excuse, or extenuate, or treat with lightness the wrong done, while they seek immunity for themselves under the claim that any charge of persecution by them is in the very nature of things impossible of proof. Nor do they stop here, but manifest their feelings by representing their Orthodox neighbors as backbiters, and hypocritical in their devotions, and the Orthodox population of the country as pursuing for years a course of crushing persecution.

What would be the natural effect of this course of the Committee? Would not those especially active in these outrages feel themselves excused if not justified in their actions, and be naturally emboldened thereby to continue them? This Committee did not design to be apologists and excitors of wrong: they have occasion to ask themselves, if they are not both? The Remonstrance itself furnishes evidence of the existence and the activity of that spirit of hostility to Orthodoxy which was charged in the Sermon. What must be the strength of that feeling if so evident in a document professedly coming from the *affections*?

12. Finally—the unfriendliness towards Orthodoxy existing in Deerfield does not always manifest itself toward all identified with that cause. Nor does a faithful testimony against the wrong done there, imply that the individual so testifying has never been the subject of kindness from those against whose wrong he protests—a discrimination disregarded by Dr. Willard. Apparently, because my personal intercourse with him has been ever pleasant, and marked by much kindness on his part, and because many of the Unitarians have always deported themselves towards me with respect

and kind regard, therefore he would deem it an unkind and improper return that, notwithstanding this, I should freely give utterance to that which is demanded by faithfulness to that cause whose interest must weigh heavier with me than the loss or the gain of human friendship. What I have written has not been in personal unkindness toward the Unitarians, nor in forgetfulness of many favors from them. With many of them my intercourse has been only pleasant; and that intercourse will be cherished among my pleasant memories; and my feelings toward them are still, and I trust will ever be, those of unchanging kindness. My residence in Deerfield I regarded, and supposed they too regarded, as a standing protest against their departure from the truth; and they could only expect that I would do what, in my esteem, the truth demanded. They seemed, indeed, often to distinguish between me and the cause for which I labored, apparently esteeming me while disliking my cause. But they should not expect me, while not unmindful of personal obligation, to be unfaithful to my great work, even though, in attempting to serve my Master, I should necessarily expose their wrongs.

I had hoped—and this hope has been followed by a degree of "disappointment"—that I should find among the Unitarians of Deerfield, more readiness to receive the truth as it is in Jesus—more willingness to come to the light, even though their deeds should be reproved—more evidence that they were searching after truth. I was "disappointed" in finding them firmly moored to decaying error, seemingly *loving* darkness rather than light, hating and fearing the truth—apparently bound up in a narrow sectarianism of error—with an evident consciousness of weakness and insecurity, yet continuing to spurn and fight against those efforts that would make known to them a more excellent way.

But there is progress in a right direction even in Deerfield. Already there is the beginning of the end. The men of a future day, whose home shall be in that quiet and beautiful valley, will ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and will walk together in the restored faith of Jesus.

THE

# CONVERSION OF NORTHERN EUROPE.

BY A. W. M'CLURE, D.D.

---

Reprinted from the "New Brunswick Review," Nov. 1854.

---

*Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, oder die Kirchengeschichte in Biographieen.* Durch Friedrich Böhringer. Zürich: 1842–1853.

This is a church history on a new plan. It is from the pen of a pastor in the Canton of Zürich. Six divisions of the work, forming as many volumes, have appeared at intervals during the last fourteen years, some parts having been delayed on account of the political troubles of Europe. It is a learned work, drawn from ancient historical sources, but eminently popular and interesting in its form. It is, in fact, arranged according to the plan of the "Acts of the Apostles." That is to say, it gives the history of the successors of the apostles in the way of personal narrations, like those given by Luke of Peter, Paul, and others, adding as much of connecting and explanatory matter as is needed to make the recital continuous and intelligible.

By this method much life and spirit is imparted to a

branch of study, which is generally allowed with equal readiness to be important and wearisome. Not to speak of other works intended rather for the professional scholar, the most valuable general histories of the church accessible to the English reader are those translated by Dr. Murdock, from the Latin of Mosheim, and by Professor Torrey from the German of Neander. Of these, the first is elaborately full and accurate, but greatly lacking in interest and vivacity. Events and dates rather than men and opinions engross the attention of the historian. Dr. Murdock's edition is supplemented by exceedingly useful biographical sketches of each important personage whose name occurs in the text. These afford very numerous foot-notes, and with the help of the index, furnish an excellent biographical dictionary of ecclesiastical antiquity. They are not, however, life-like portraits, but outlines rather in chalk and charcoal. Neander's incomparable work, of which the fifth and last volume of Professor Torrey's version has just appeared, is chiefly occupied with the philosophy of the subject, with the history and workings of opinions, and manifestations of the spirit and life of Christianity. The writer is, in fact, so absorbed in the speculative view, that he sees real men only "as trees walking."

To the industry of Böhringer another field lay open. Leaving the annalist to his facts, and the philosopher to his generalizations and comparative anatomy of ideas and systems of belief, our author devotes himself to *men*, rather than to things and thoughts. He aims to produce the leading men of the successive ages, each in his own personality, as he appeared in actual life. He presents the history of the church in a gallery of full-length portraits of the men of chief note among their contemporaries. Each biography has so much of prefatory information as is requisite to introduce the subject in his living relation to his times, and to the changes going on in the church and in the world; and each is closed with a similar statement, to smoothe the transition to the succeeding subject of the author's graphic powers. Nor let it be supposed that this method of writing history must needs be partial and defective. Such men as Chrysostom and Augustine "are the abstract, and brief

chronicles of the time." And their biographer, in bringing them back to life, "holds, as it were, the mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own features, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure." Whosoever reads Middleton's Life of Cicero, or Jortin's Life of Erasmus, or Marshall's Life of Washington, not only learns the personal traits and fortunes of those great men, but also surveys, in connexion with them, the moving panorama of their nations and their times.

Our author gives the Protestant and evangelical view of his subject as well as can be reasonably expected from a modern German, a race which seems too generally tormented by an unhappy passion for "many-sidedness." To make his work complete, many additional biographies are wanting. Thus he does not give us Ephraim Syrus, or any other representative of the Oriental churches, except the Greek and the Coptic. Neither does he exhibit Patrick, the evangelist of Ireland ; or Columba, the saint of Iona ; or Methodius and Cyrilles, the apostles of the Sclavonians ; nor Ulphilas, the Gothic bible translator ; though these, to name no more, seem to stand right in his path. He has our hearty thanks, however, for what he has done, and done so well ; and we hope he has led the way to a new mode of treating ecclesiastical history, which will awaken fresh zeal in a study capable, beyond most others, of yielding at once instruction and delight. Lord Bacon has justly said, "It is not St. Augustine's nor St. Ambrose's works that will make so wise a divine as ecclesiastical history thoroughly read and observed."

The first *Band* of the work is in four parts (*abtheilungen*), and covers the three centuries following the apostolic age. The first and second parts, published in 1842, contain the lives of Ignatius, Polycarp, Perpetua, Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Athanasius, Basil, and the Gregories of Nyssa and Nazianzum. The third part, printed in 1845, is occupied with Ambrose and Augustine. The fourth part, issued in 1846, gives us Chrysostom, Olympias, Leo, and Gregory the Great. Of the second *Band*, which is devoted to the middle ages, two

parts have appeared; the first, issued in 1849, depicts Columban and Gall, Boniface of Germany, Anschar, Anselm of Canterbury, Bernard, and Arnold of Brescia; the other part, which came out last year, is taken up with Peter Abelard, Heloise, Innocent III., Francis of Assisi, and Elizabeth of Thuringen.

As it is impossible here to review the whole field before us, this article will be devoted to a single topic of great interest, though as yet but little understood, the conversion of the barbarians of Europe, which followed the downfall of the Roman empire. For many of the facts here given, we are indebted to Böhringer, though by far the greater part is drawn from other sources.

The central and northern parts of Europe were peopled by three great tides of migration from the East. The earliest of these was that of the Celtic race, who appear to have been the first settlers of Gaul, Britain, and Ireland. This race was mostly overwhelmed and dissolved in the mightier masses of the Gothic migration which rolled after it, drove it along, and crowding it into the western limits of Europe, left only Celtic remnants in Brittany, Cornwall, Wales, the Scotch Highlands, and chiefly in hapless Ireland. When the Celts originally left the shores of the Black Sea for new homes in the West, is not known, or even conjectured.

About seven hundred years before our Saviour's advent, the second huge flood of Asiatic migration burst upon Europe. This consisted of the Scythian or Gothic race, to whose stock the greater part of the northern nations of that continent belong, including the Saxon, Scandinavian, Frank, German, and Belgic tribes. This flood was fifteen hundred years rolling to and fro, with its impetuous streams, and stormy, desolating billows, before the waters found their level, and sank into repose. And now, for the last two centuries, it has found a new outlet, though with a far more calm and equable flow, and is pouring an enormous current of population over this vast continent of the West.

Since the Christian era, the third main flood of Eastern migration—the Sclavonic—has broken into the bounds of

Europe. Though, at first, this people forced their Gothic predecessors to yield them room, they have been compelled, after long and bloody struggles, to give up their nationalities, though still retaining their acquired territorial limits. To the Sclavic race belong the Poles, and nearly half of the ill-cemented masses of the Austrian empire; and also the Russians in Europe.

All these races, at the time of their settlements in the western parts of the Old World, were in a state of barbarism and Paganism. They are now all civilized in greater or lesser degree, and all bear the Christian name. This amazing moral revolution, affecting the whole existence of two hundred millions of immortal beings now living on the earth, took place within that thousand years, from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries, which we commonly term the middle ages. It is hardly possible to conceive of a question of greater historical interest, than that which relates to the ways and means by which this stupendous change was brought to pass. This question, however, seems only of late to have attracted the attention of historians; and has never, so far as we can find, been thoroughly investigated.

The brief and rapid survey which we now propose to take of mediæval missions would be well preceded, no doubt, if space allowed, by some notice of the religions and manners of the populations we are to speak of, as they were when the first Christian missionaries found them. We can only say, as to religion, that to the Celts, the Druids were what the Brahmins are to the Hindoos. Deep mystery rests upon the system of the Druids, who are chiefly known to us through the notices collected by Julius Cæsar. Though not sunk to the lower grades of idolatry, theirs was a stern and inexorable superstition. Their sanguinary gods were appeased by the blood of numerous human victims. Sometimes huge images in human shape were made of wickerwork, and filled with captives, who were burned alive in them. The more ferocious Goths cherished a much wilder mythology, of which human sacrifices, offered by the hands of raving priestesses, formed a large part. Among their many deities, of whom the sun, the moon, Tuisc, Woden, Thor, Freyga, and Satur, have given the names to the days of our week, the chief was Odin, a deified hero, who is thought to have

migrated to the shores of the Baltic, early in the third century. The worship of these infernal gods on earth, too faithfully conformed to their darling employments in the dread abodes of the invisible world, where, in constant alternation, they hewed each other to pieces in delirious conflicts, and then, perfectly healed, recruited themselves in horrid orgies of drunkenness and lust.

As respects the manners of these ancient populations, they were such as are usually found among people entirely occupied in keeping cattle, in hunting, and in war. Theirs was a life of restless activity, peril, and privation, and tended to make them patient, vigilant, and brave. Such a life, also, called the virtues of the women into constant exercise, and procured for the female sex a rank and estimation among the German tribes, never accorded to it by the ancient civilizations of Asia, Greece, and Rome, and only exceeded and matured by the happy influence of the Christian faith. These are the brighter lines of the grim picture. All else is dark and revolting. For dwellings they burrowed in the earth, or abode in huts no better than what still suffice to shelter the Caffre and Basout. Such was their misery and degradation, that among the Britons one woman was often wife to an association of ten or a dozen men. The ruling passion of our honored Saxon ancestry seems to have been for plunder and kidnapping. This is felicitously let out in their word *stalworth*, or stealworthy, involving the compliment that the person so designated was *worth the stealing*, at considerable risk. These Saxons (Sach-suna, or "sons of the sword") preferred, in their piratical excursions, to go to sea in a storm, because they would be more likely to take their victims by surprise. When no other enemies offered, they indulged their ferocity and exercised their arms by fighting one another. Old Regnar Lodbrog was one of the vikingr, or commanders, who, having no room on shore, reigned on the decks of their pirate-fleets, and made themselves terrible to all the western coasts of Europe. This "infandous old villain"—to apply to him a phrase of *Cotton Mather*—whose life was a long-drawn orgasm of rapine and butchery, at last became the prisoner of Aella, one of the Saxon kings of England; and was thrown into a dungeon stocked with adders, to serve as

his executioners. In his *quida*, or death-song, the ruthless buccaneer boasts of having led fifty-one of these distant marauding expeditions. He exults in every ghastly circumstance of cruelty and death. He prefers the pleasures of the death-dealing sword to the joys of the social feast. He glories in having turned to anguish the happiness of youthful lovers; and even equals the pleasure of the deed to the sweetest hour of his life, when he "seated by him on his couch" his "bright bride," the fearless Aslauga. He closes with exhorting his sons to avenge his fall, which they were not slow to do; and as the adders, less venomous than himself, strike their fangs into him, he hails the goddesses sent from Odin to invite him home, where he shall "gladly, with the Asæ, drink ale in his lofty seat." The whole piece breathes the ferocity of a malignant demon, rather than any passion which could be conceived to animate a human bosom.

The very Aella who captured and destroyed this monster, was wont, like the other Saxon warriors, to make "spread eagles" of his captives, to whom he was not disposed to show quarter. This was done by cleaving off the bones from each side of the spine, and throwing back the flaps, after the manner of the extended wings of a bird, so as to open to view the heaving of the lungs, and the pulsing of the heart. One of their chiefs was called Olver Barnakall, or, Olver the Bairn's-man, the preserver of the bairns, or children. He came by this humane appellation as follows: It was the fashion of the Scandinavian pirates to tear the infants from the captive mothers' breasts, and, tossing them high in air, impale them on the spears as they fell. Olver was the first to forbid this horrible sport, which would have made the hair of old Herod to stand on end. And for this *softness*, the chieftain, rugged as he was, obtained, in derision, his honorable name.

It is scarce ten centuries since these atrocities were done. We spare the reader any further description, believing that he will be ready to confess that no people ever stood more in need of the subduing power of the gospel, than our brave and energetic, but savage Saxon ancestry, and others of kindred stock, whose blood is now running in our veins. It will be readily acknowledged, too, that the missionaries who carried to those nations the gospel of the meek and merci-

ful Redeemer, and brought them, in some measure, under its benign and transforming influence, must have been men of superior minds, of dauntless courage, strong faith, and unquenchable zeal. Their success was a sublime triumph of moral courage and spiritual power over physical bravery and animal strength.

We cannot repress our curiosity to learn something of the personal history of those noble missionaries, and the means by which they were enabled to do so great a work. Unhappily, our information respecting them is very meagre; and what little we have is much diluted with legendary lore. "Abating only holy writ," says Fuller, "it is as impossible to find antiquity without fable, as an old face without wrinkles." The mission-stations were all cloisters, the missionaries themselves were all monks, and the few biographies of them were also written by monastics. These recluses, unskilled in writing, with their imaginations excited by solitude, and veneration for their subjects, easily turned the rude tropes of panegyrists into actual miracles. Thus, when we read of St. Gall, the godly apostle of Switzerland, in the seventh century, that he banished serpents and dragons, and tamed the bears, and made them serve him, we are to understand by this, that he defeated the devices of the devil, and subdued the minds of the wild heathen. But the monkish chronicler, who almost ever held it to be his duty to embellish the truth with as much pious romancing as possible, would make these rhetorical phrases as handed down to him, the ground-work of many a tale of wonder, attesting the supernatural power of his hero.

As the ancient missions were not carried on by ecclesiastical boards or societies for propagandism, we have no detailed reports of labors and results, and no files of correspondence setting forth the perils and pleasures, the discouragements and successes, of the evangelizing work. A few detached facts and scattered letters only remain to us, as hints and glimpses of what was done. The laborers, cut off from the busy world, and careless of fame, took no pains to keep alive the memory of their actions and sufferings. Few records were made, and those, for the most part, incidentally, in connexion with other subjects. And of these scanty records, but a small portion has escaped the ravages

of time; and what has escaped would not make us grieve very deeply for what is lost—unless, in charity to the ancients, we agree with Lord Bacon, who complains that "time seemeth to be of the nature of a river or flood, that bringeth down to us that which is light or blown up, and sinketh and drowneth that which is solid and grave."

Here we are tempted to digress into considering the justice of terming the mediæval times the dark ages. One scornfully exclaims, "I know nothing of those ages which knew nothing!" But if he were so ignorant of them, whence did he get his knowledge of *their* ignorance? Another indignant wit retorts, "we call them the dark ages, because we are so much in the dark about them." But if we are so much in the dark about them, how can we know but that they were dark?

The truth is, however, that we have all the light that is requisite on this subject. We do know who were the men of chief note in their times; and of all of them who handled the pen, we have enough preserved in the mediæval literature to enable us to judge as to the degree of their illumination. When the high-church essayist, Maitland, meets the narrative of Luther's first finding a Bible in the convent at Erfurth, or the Reformer's assertion that Andrew Carlstadt had been a doctor in divinity eight years before he ever read the Epistles of Paul, the sturdy ecclesiologist laughs at such tales as simply impossible. When called upon to retort, with something besides a scoff, he produces, perhaps, a long letter from Peter Venerabilis, the worthy abbot of Clugni, or, perchance, a court-sermon preached before the emperor by good old Bardo, archbishop of Maintz. And because these abound with quotations from all parts of the Holy Scriptures (dragged in, it must be allowed, with little regard to their real meaning), he would have us think that manuscript Bibles were quite as accessible then as printed Bibles are now, as well as much more read, and much better understood! Though these performances breathe a pious spirit, their literary character is so low, that, if they had originated in our time, no one would have thought less of them than Maitland himself. But in his zeal to show how fond the contemporaries of Peter and Bardo were of such Scriptural instruction, and how well able to appreciate it, he offers proof of the high popularity

of those old writers in their day. Hence, he infers, that the tenth and twelfth centuries were periods of general and brilliant illumination!

The middle ages bear ample testimony to their own darkness. Those who rose above their time in genius or in virtue, had a profound and melancholy sense of the general degradation. Hear what King Alfred says of his Anglican churchmen then :—"Very few were they, on this side the Humber, who could repeat their daily prayers in English, or translate any letter from the Latin into English; and I ween that there were not many beyond the Humber. So few were they, that I cannot think of so much as one on the south of the Thames, when I began to reign." Nor was the case very much better on the continent. Even Cardinal Baronius, when he comes to the tenth century of his elaborate "Annales," gives it the following hard character :—"We now enter on a period, which, for its sterility of every excellence, may be denominated *iron;* for its luxuriant growth of vice, *leaden;* for its dearth of writers, *dark*." Muratori, though anxiously softening the severity of Baronius, concedes that "with too much truth has the epithet *iron* been applied to this unfortunate epoch."

Near the end of the eighth century, the illustrious Charlemagne, the colossus of his time, made a most earnest effort, sustained by all the resources of imperial patronage and power, to revive sound learning, and diffuse it over the semi-barbarous west. But his noble efforts were in vain. He could neither find able teachers, nor willing scholars. The meteoric flashes of his literary monks, the Anglo-Saxon Alcuin and John the Irishman, and others, died fitfully away, and the darkness grew deeper than ever.

The prospects of the church, viewed as an outward and visible polity, had never been so brilliant as in the fifth century. She had reached the height of her hopes. She had become the church of the Roman empire. Under her great Theodosius, she saw at once the suppression of pagan worship, and of Arianism, the chief heresy of the time. After ages of toil and suffering, she was at the summit of influence and glory. But, all at once, the Roman empire fell with a crash like "the crack of doom." The church's strong support was gone. She found herself once more at the mercy

of her foes. She fell into the hands of Goths and Vandals, Franks and Burgundians,—the zealots either of a bloody paganism, or of a bitterly persecuting Arianism. She accomplished, however, a second propagation. She converted the new masters of the world as she had the old. But it was rather in name than in fact. Barbarians became bishops, and bishops became barbarians, and spent their lives as leaders of plundering bands. Long ages of civil discord and desolation came. At last, in the eleventh century, the famous pope Hildebrand, "like Charlemagne and Peter the Great, a reformer of the despotic school," succeeded in establishing the papal theocracy which reigned over Europe with such absolute sway, till overturned by the more famous Luther, a reformer of the popular school.

During this long struggle with barbarism and anarchy, the working power of the church lay in the monastic system. The monks were her police and her militia. It were long to tell of the origin, nature, and workings of monkery; and how prodigiously it swarmed in Europe, under the rule of St. Benedict, from the beginning of the sixth century. Suffice it to say that, so far as concerns the propagation of the faith, it proceeded almost wholly from the cloisters. These were the schools where the missionaries were educated, and whence they were sent forth to teach the unconverted and half-converted heathen. Almost the first effort of the missionaries, on reaching the field of their labors was the rearing of a new cloister as the basis of their operations, and the centre of their influence. Here they trained the native youth to take a part in their work; and especially they redeemed young captives, taken in war from neighboring tribes, and sent them, when prepared, to carry back to their early homes the faith they had learned to love. Leaving out the monastic element, our missionaries to the Indian tribes pursue a course substantially similar. They select a spot convenient for their purpose, and there erect a dwelling, a sanctuary, and a school, inducing their converts to settle in the neighborhood, for the double object of teaching and civilizing them, and from thence diffusing the truth on every side by means of preaching tours, and preaching stations, and native helpers.

As a picture of the times, let us take the planting of the

monastic mission at St. Gall, in Switzerland, about the year 614. Gall was the chief scholar of Columban, who, in the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh centuries, did the work of an apostle in France, Switzerland, and northern Italy. When Columban went to Italy, he left Gall behind him sick. Gall was then above sixty years old. On his recovery, he inquired of a deacon, Hiltebald, who subsisted by fishing and hunting, and knew all the passes and valleys of that wild region, for a place suited to the manner of life of a conventual recluse. Hiltebald knew of such a spot, abounding in hills, and dales, and springs of water; but infested with bears, wolves, and wild boars. "I fear," said he, "that if I take you there, they will eat you up." But Gall, noways daunted, replied, "It is the apostle's word, If God be for us, who can be against us? He who freed Daniel from the lions' den, is able to keep me from the wild beasts. We know that all things must work for good to them that love God." The whole of that day and night he fasted, and prayed for a happy result of his journey. They started early in the morning, Hiltebald in advance. After three hours' travel, the deacon proposed the taking of a morsel of bread and water to strengthen them for the rest of their journey. Said Gall, "Take what you need, my son, for your bodily comfort; as for me, I taste nothing till the Lord shall show me my destined abode." Hiltebald concluded to follow his example; and they resumed their march till the day was nearly done. They came, at last, to the brook Steinach, and traced its course to where it dashes over the rocks, and forms a whirlpool. It was a pleasant spot. They halted. They threw a net, and took a great many fishes. The deacon struck a fire, broiled the fish, and took bread from his knapsack. Meanwhile Gall stepped aside for prayer, but became entangled in a thicket, and fell. The deacon ran to help him up. But Gall, who saw in this the finger of Providence, cried out, "Let me alone! Here is the place of my rest for all time, and here will I dwell." He at once consecrated the spot whereon he was fallen with prayer. On rising, he twisted a cross of hazel-twigs, and stuck it in the ground. Like all the Irish missionaries, he wore a reliquary about his neck. These relics he appended to the cross. Again they prostrated themselves. Gall

prayed, "Lord Jesus Christ! Maker of the world! who by thy cross hast saved man, let this place be inhabited by thine elect to thy praise." The day was now spent; and having thankfully eaten their repast, they lay down upon the grass for their repose. But the man of God, unable to sleep, spent the night in fervent prayer. Thus was founded the famous convent of St. Gall, which was long an active centre for missionary work among the heathen Allemans.

The evangelization of the now united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland presents some singular alternations. The first introduction of Christianity into the British Isles is wrapped in much obscurity, and tricked out with fable. All that seems certain is, that there were Christians in Britain as early as the second and third centuries; and that many martyrs suffered there in the Diocletian persecution. The population was then Celtic, with a little admixture of the Roman. The pioneers of the gospel there appeared to have come from the Oriental, rather than from the Latin churches; and for a long period the British churches refused to acknowledge the supremacy of the Romish see. Another of their peculiarities was, that their bishops acknowledged ecclesiastical subjection to the presbyter-abbots of the convents by which their sees had been evangelized.

The famous Patrick, whose proper name was Succath, was born in the neighborhood of Dumbarton, in Scotland, about the year 372. His father was a deacon of the village church of Bonaven, now called Kirkpatrick. When sixteen years of age, he was seized by freebooters and sold as a slave, to a chieftain in the north of Ireland. He served as a shepherd for six years, during which, he says, "The Lord brought me to a sense of my unbelief; so that, although late, I minded me of my sins, and turned with my whole heart to the Lord my God." Making his escape, he returned to his friends. Ten years later he was again kidnapped, and carried to Gaul, whence he was ransomed by some Christian merchants. He was restored to his friends, but felt an intense desire to preach the gospel to the heathen among whom his youth was spent. He re-visited Gaul, in order to qualify himself the better for his intended work, which he commenced in earnest in his forty-fifth year. His success was marvellous. Ere he died, Ireland was converted from the Druidical su-

perstitions, and was studded with numerous convents. Some of these numbered three thousand monks, who were the teachers and civilizers of the country.

One of these monks, Columban, went with his companions to attempt the conversion of the Scottish Highlanders. He founded the famous convent and theological school of Iona, whose pupils ceased not their labors till the whole of Britain had abandoned idolatry, and submitted to the faith. These were the Culdees, so famed for their piety, and the comparative purity of their religious belief. In the sixth century the Angles and Saxons had completely overrun the whole island, excepting Wales and the Highlands of Scotland, whither the native British retired, carrying the gospel with them. The island was once more a heathen country, devoted to the worship of Odin, the Goth, and all his demoniac demi-gods. In the year 596, Pope Gregory sent Augustine with forty monks, to commence the re-conversion of the island. These went to Ethelbert, king of Kent, whose queen, Bertha, a Frankish princess, was a Christian. From this time, the work went on unsteadily, but surely, till in eighty-two years the whole of the Saxon population had embraced the gospel. Let those who wonder at what they call the slow advances of modern Protestant missions to the heathen, ponder this fact. After the conversion of England and Ireland, they furnished a multitude of zealous and self-denying men, who, as they were wont to say, left all for Christ, and devoted themselves to the propagation of the gospel, throughout central and northern Europe. Their real work was mostly done "without observation." What purports to be their history is, for the most part, but a rich flower-bed of pious legends adorning the wide field of those unstoried centuries.

At the close of the seventh century, the German races in Europe presented a strange intermixture and effervescence of orthodoxy, Arianism, and Paganism. The Franks had the greatest savor of the gospel; but in so saying, we do not so much commend them as disparage the rest. The old Latin bishops, who were in office when the Roman empire in those regions fell, seem, many of them, to have been holy and zealous men of God, who labored well and hard to bring over their Gothic conquerors to the Christian faith.

Their immediate successors of the German blood, as Arnulph of Metz, Kunibert of Köln, Amandus of Mästricht, and others, were devout and earnest ministers. But of their successors, a part, disgusted with the savage tempers and manners of the wild people, and despairing of society, flung down the pastoral staff, and forsook the world for solitude; while the rest were plagued and thwarted by clergymen, "who spent their time among hunters, hounds, and hawks, cared little for order or doctrine, and turned the halidome into a fortalice, and the manger of Bethlehem into a stall for war horses." The whole body became too degenerate to attempt the conversion of the heathen, and the more than half-heathenish Christians around them.

The obscure and scanty records of the time indicate that the final conversion of the Germanic races was the result of three great missionary movements, or aggressive campaigns. The first line of these operations was formed by the countries on the Danube and the Rhine, and those which lay between. These had been Roman provinces. The missionaries here were Irish, from what was then called "the isle of saints," with Columban for their leading spirit. These men were quite independent of the church of Rome, and its usages.

Beyond these, the second line was made up of the lands of the Franks, the Hessians, and the Thuringians, in the heart of Germany, among whom the Romans could gain no permanent foothold. The missionaries here were Englishmen; of whom the master mind was Boniface. This mission was very strongly marked with the episcopal and hierarchal character, and maintained strict unity with the Romish see. At different times, as the men were wanted, the great English cloisters of Glastonbury, Malmesbury, Winburn, and others, sent out constant streams of self-denying men to follow in the wake of Boniface. Among these were Lull, the successor of Boniface as archbishop of Mainz, Burghard, Witta, Willibald, and his brother Wunebald. Nor let us think it an innovation of modern missions, that females, Protestant sisters of charity and mothers of mercy, have been sent with their sickles to reap in God's harvest. English nuns did for their sex in Germany, what English monks were doing for the men. It was the plan of Boniface to bring about the

education of the people through the education of the women. Among the most noted of those "women who lâbored with him in the gospel," were Thekla, prioress at Ochsenfurth, and afterwards of Kissingen on the Main; Kunihilda, the kinswoman of Lull, and her daughter Berathgild, who went to Thuringia; Kunitrude, who labored in Bavaria; and more than all, Lioba, from the convent of Winthorn, "beautiful as an angel, bewitching in discourse, and well informed in the Holy Scriptures and the canons," who became abbess of Bischofshein, and the friend of Charlemagne and his empress Hildegarde. The activity of these women wrought mostly in an inconspicuous way; nevertheless history shows them to have been in their place during the early nursing of the infant civilization of Germany." "It is God's will, that women be busy by the side of every cradle."

The third line of Gothic population which met the next advances of Christianity was the old Saxon. This race held possession of northern Germany. The sword had to do more than its share in their conversion, which was prosecuted too much in the policy and spirit of the monarchs of the Franks. Where the soldier halted, the missionary-monk began his career. The English, who were a kindred race, also took the lead in this movement, though the chief direction of it fell into the hands of Anschar, commonly styled "the Apostle of the North." The Christianizing of the north, well set forward by him, was continued, under manifold hindrances and alternations, mostly not in his benevolent spirit. It was most quietly effected in Sweden, most violently in Denmark, and most bloodily in Norway. In the latter country, where it became a struggle between princely despotism and the popular liberties, it resembled the triumphs of Mahomedanism. The complete Christianizing of Denmark took place in the beginning of the eleventh century, under Canute the Great. This was followed by the Christianizing of Sweden, under Inge, and of Norway, under King Olave the Saint, in the middle of the same century. In the twelfth century, Finland was converted; and in the end of this and the beginning of the thirteenth century, Livonia, Esthonia, and Courland, were brought over by the brothers of the sword and the Danes. Prussia was reduced to the

faith by the Teutonic knights by the middle of the thirteenth century.

During the same period the Christianization of the Sclavonic nations of the west was going on. In the ninth century, Bohemia and Moravia, south-eastwards; and Poland and Silesia north-eastwards, as well as Russia in Europe, which fell to the Greek church. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Hungary, to the south-east, and the Wends, between the Saale and the Oder, to the north-east, after long and violent resistance, submitted to the cross. The political subjugation of Europe had proceeded mostly from the east towards the west, and from the north towards the south. But the intellectual and spiritual conquests took the opposite directions, from the west to the east, and from the south to the north.

As the best illustration we can give of these three grand missionary movements, we will briefly sketch the life of the prominent leader in each of them.

Of these, the first in order is Columban. He was born in the Irish province of Leinster. He was the darling of his mother, who could not bear to have him out of her sight. He was finely formed in body; and as to his mind, showed very early a passion for study. The boy once visited the cell of a hermitess. In a fiery strain, she exhorted him to do what she could not, owing to the weakness of her sex—to devote himself to the service of religion in lands beyond the sea. "But thou, brave youth, do not thou abide the temptations of thy native land. Up, youngling! and away!" Her words set his soul in flames. He hastened home, and took leave of his weeping mother; replying to her entreaties, "Hast thou not heard what the Lord saith, 'He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me?'" He went to study the Scriptures, chiefly the Psalms, with the abbot Silenus. He next betook himself to the monastery of Bangor, where, under the direction of good old Father Congall, he gave his whole soul to the practice of the ascetic piety of the times. Here he spent many years, acquiring a wide-spread reputation, and attracting numerous scholars. When he was thirty years old, he felt the burnings of that fire which our Saviour says he came to kindle on the earth. He told his venerated abbot of his wishes.

Father Congall was loath to part with him; but gave him his blessing, and twelve brethren to be his companions and helpers. Among them were Gall, Magnus, and Kilian, who afterwards were of note. About the year 590, they sailed for France.

Contrary to their first intention, at the entreaty of the Burgundian King Sigebert, they here selected a place of settlement, making choice of the ruined castle of Anegray. Here they laboriously earned their bread by tilling the soil, all day long, like Martha; and at night, like Mary, sitting at the feet of the Lord. They pursued with zeal, their evangelical labors among the nominal Christians, and unreclaimed and barbarous Pagans of the Vosges. So great was the recourse to him for instruction, that Columban was obliged to establish other monasteries at Luxeuil and Fontenay. He resided at these by turns, but chiefly at Luxeuil. That they were largely reinforced from Ireland, appears from the fact, that in twelve years' time seventeen of these missionaries were laid in their graves.

In the religious life of these monks, who differed widely from those of modern times, there was a strangely inconsistent dualism, which it is hard to understand. On the one side, they show a religious experience purely evangelical, and, on the other, a pharisaic formalism and austerity of practice, which quite nullified that word of Jesus, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." In one of his discourses, Columban says, "May God deign so to waken me, one of the least of his servants, from spiritual slumber, and so to inflame me with the fire of love divine, that the flame shall even burn upon my brow. May I so serve him, that my lamp shall ever burn in the temple of the Lord, and give light to all that enter the house of my God." He then breaks forth into prayer—"O my God, my Jesus! kindle our lamps, that they may continually shine in thy temple; and from thee, the eternal light, take light eternal, so that our darkness shall turn to brightness, and the darkness of the world disappear. So grant, my Jesus, thy light to my lamp, that in its light that most holy place may be revealed where thou art the priest. Show thyself to us, dearest Redeemer, when we knock for thee—so that thee only may we may know, thee only love, thee only desire, thee only

think of night and day. Shed abroad in us such a love to thee as shall not be unworthy of thee, and so that we may love none beside thee for ever. Thou art the fountain of living water, therefore bring me to this fountain, merciful God! that I may drink with all thy thirsting ones of that living water, and ever delight in its wondrous sweetness, and ever say—'How sweet is the spring of living waters!' Truly, I crave great things; but thou, O King, hast promised and given great things; for nothing is greater than thou; and thou hast given thyself to us, and hast given thyself away for us. Thou art our all, our life, our light, our strength, our food, our drink, our God!" Such was the habitual frame of this good man's spirit. And what child of God does not recognise in this language the fervent sighs of a filial spirit thirsting and longing for the living God?

From this bright and golden obverse of the medal, it is with pain and chagrin that we turn to its baser reverse. Historical fidelity requires that we also look at the darker side of the dualism in the life of these men of God. It is sad to see the folly of good men, who, "having begun in the Spirit," seek to be "made perfect by the flesh." That the mind is greatly benefited by a due regard to dietetic rules and the laws of health, is undeniable. But it is a gross and satanical abuse of this truth, to hold, as do all the various monastic orders, that any amount of bodily austerities can work a renovation of the heart and its affections. Religion is degraded, when its votary seeks to starve and flog himself into a perfect hatred of sin, and supreme love to God. Columban was not content to impose upon his missionary-monks an obedience which made them little more than machines moved only at the touch of his finger, and a silence to be broken by no needless word, and a poverty which refused any treasure but what is laid up in heaven, besides humility, and chastity, and devotional duties discharged thrice each day, and as often each night. He was not content to prescribe, in general, that it belonged to the life of a monk "daily to fast, daily to pray, daily to labor, and daily to read." He laid down innumerable regulations for carrying out this system; and every minute transgression was punished by a certain amount of fasting, praying, or psalm-singing, or by a definite tale of stripes by whip

or rod. Take a sample of the wearisome detail. Whoever, when a blessing is asked at table, does not answer, Amen! let him take six stripes; whoever forgets to make the sign of the cross, six stripes; whoever omits the prayer before and after labor, twelve stripes; whoever forgets the chrismal, five-and-twenty lashes; and if he loses it, fifty; whoever speaks alone with a woman, must fast two whole days, or else take two hundred lashes, in eight doses of five-and-twenty each; whoever speaks to a layman without permission, shall atone for the atrocity by singing four-and-twenty psalms, or by submitting to fifty stripes—the expiatory merit of singing a psalm being, it seems, just equal to that of two lashes! And so these ridiculous penances are set down with tedious prolixity.

The lives of Columban are filled with his miracles, in which he repeated nearly all that are recorded in both the Testaments, and very many besides. It is plain that all their self-inflicted castigations never cured his monkish biographers of their innate propensity to pious lying, in order to bedeck the memory of their hero. But even these marvellous legends are a proof of the profound impression made upon his disciples by the powerful personality of this ever faithful, though often erring, witness for Christ. He was, in truth, a godly servant of our Lord in a dreary time; and let us charitably impute the bulk of his practical errors to the miserable bewilderment of his day.

Twelve years Columban dwelt in Gaul, laboring himself, and directing the labors of a host of his disciples, in the glorious work of evangelization. At last he fell into conflict with the local ecclesiastics, who could not endure the rigors of his discipline, but grounded their opposition to him on the fact, that he followed the traditions of the Irish church as to the time for celebrating Easter, instead of the order of the Church of Rome. We have not time to describe this controversy, in which Columban showed not only great decision and freedom of spirit, but also a kind and catholic temper. He maintained his independence against the French prelates in their synod, as well as against the popes Gregory the Great and Boniface IV. To Gregory he wrote, that he ought not to decide the case as one of his predecessors, Leo the Great, had done; and remarks that

"a living dog is better than a dead lion," thus playing upon their names, Gregorius answering for a faithful *watch-dog*, as Leo for a *lion*.

Before this dispute was disposed of, Columban fell into a more serious difficulty with Brunehilda, the vicious old grandmother of the Burgundian king, Theodorick II. This haughty and ambitious woman, in order to keep in her own hands the administration of affairs, surrounded the prince with courtesans and flatterers. Columban, both by word and letter, sternly rebuked the vices of the king; and at last, when milder discipline proved unavailing, threatened to proceed to excommunication. This was too much to be borne. A furious opposition arose, in which Columban showed a noble firmness of soul. On the pretext, that he would not conform the usages of his monks to those practised in the French cloisters, it was decreed that he should be carried back to Ireland, with his brethren from that country. But such was the veneration in which this man of God was held, that no one ventured fully to execute the order. After a sorrowful parting from his spiritual children, he was taken from place to place, till they brought him to Nantes. Here he was placed with his companions in a ship, which met such strange hindrances, that the master concluded he had a Jonas on board, and put his passengers and their goods on shore, and then pursued his voyage without difficulty. As this was looked upon as a supernatural token of God's will, Columban went back to his beloved cloister without opposition, and with greater respect than ever.

After a short stay among his friends, he received an earnest invitation from Clothaire, the Frankish king of Neustria, to settle in his dominions, and labor for the conversion of the bordering tribes. Spending a short time at the court of Clothaire, and reforming certain irregularities there, he accepted a like invitation from Theodebert II., king of Austrasia. Passing the Rhine, he went to Northern Switzerland; and commenced his second great missionary enterprise. He began his efforts among the barbarous Allemans, in the neighborhood of Zurich. But the pagans told him and Gall, that their old gods had ever given them rain and heat enough; and should not be forsaken while

they ruled so well. It is said, that the heathen once brought a cask of beer to be offered to Odin. Columban, in a fit of zeal, blew upon it; whereupon the vessel exploded, and the beer flew out. Monk Jonas tells us, that the beer was possessed of the devil, all ready to enter the souls of the worshippers as soon as they drank it! Many of the heathen, whom the preaching of the gospel had failed to convert, are reported to have turned on the spot, convinced by the explosion of the beer barrel! The zeal of the missionaries now fermented with equal violence: and in its effervescence, they desisted from the slow process of preaching, to demonstrate in a more practical way, the impotence of the gods. They set the temple on fire, and cast the idols and offerings into the Zürich sea. The enraged heathen put the lives of the monks in peril; and Columban left them with a fearful imprecation, which sprang not so much from a heart filled with anger, as from a soul roused even to fanaticism against the abominations of idolatry.

The zealous band now journeyed to the northeast, through mountains and forests, till they reached a ruined castle at Bregentz. This spot was well suited to their purpose; and here they tarried three years, laboring assiduously in their usual way. They found here a chapel, which, in the old Roman times, had been dedicated to St. Aurelia, but was now used as an idol's temple, having three idols of gilt bronze. Here Gall preached to the Allemans, of whom a great multitude were present, it being one of their feast-days. He called upon them to repent, and turn to God, and his Son, who had opened for lost men the way to the kingdom of heaven. And then, by way of practical application, he seized the idols, and in the sight of all, dashed them in pieces, and hurled the fragments into the lake. Many were converted at once; but the rest went off in a rage. Columban reconsecrated the church, and restored it to its original use. They met with great success, and proportionable opposition. An order was procured from Gunzo, duke of the Allemans, for their expulsion, on the pretence that their settlements interfered with the public hunting grounds. Two of the monks were also killed by the infidels, as they were searching for a strayed cow. This was in the year 612.

As Brunehilda and Theodorick, by the bloody battle of Zulpich, had extended their dominion over the Allemans, this was another reason for leaving a region which had fallen under the power of his old enemies. Columban now resolved to do what he had long desired, and to seek a final settlement in the territory of the Venetians. As Gall was sick, he had to remain; and became, as we have already mentioned, the founder of extensive missionary undertakings for Switzerland. Columban and his other brethren pursued their journey, and had a most friendly reception from Agilulf, the Lombard King; who, though an Arian, gave him liberty to choose his home where he would. The good old man had heard of a St. Peter's Church, in a fruitful valley with a lovely stream, inclosed in "the hollow breast of Apennine." Here he set up the staff of his rest. He rebuilt the ruined church, and founded the far-famed cloister of Babbio, the third and last seat of his missionary toils. Here he confuted the Arians, and took an active part in giving peace to the church, to which Agilulf and all his people were reconciled.

And here Columban died in 615, having seen seventy-two years or more. To form a just estimate of his life, and methods of propagating Christianity, we must bear in mind that his real actions and teachings are now irretrievably mixed up with monkish fictions which bear the manifest impress of later times. He was a true son of the primitive Irish church, full of zeal for the gospel, inflexible for the truth, bending neither to pope nor king; yet gentle towards all men, and especially to the poor and humble. He knew how to blend a laborious practical energy with love for retirement and contemplation. He often withdrew into the solitary wilds and caves, with a huge manuscript Bible on his shoulder, lost night and day together in meditation and soliloquy on its sacred contents, which were the food of his soul.

We now pass on, over the next hundred years, to the second great harvest gathered on the German field, in the heart of Europe, where Boniface was the chief reaper.

His proper name was Winfred. He was born at Kirton, in Devonshire, in the year 680. When but four or five years old, he showed a strong desire to be a monk; which

was excited by the preaching of itinerants who often held forth at the house of his father, a man of some distinction. His father, who doated on him as the heir of his estates, was unwilling to give him up; but yielded in an hour of sickness. He first studied at the cloister of Exeter, and then at that of Nutcell, where he distinguished himself by his studious and austere habits. Being of a very practical turn withal, he was much employed by his convent as their agent for business matters. Many resorted to him for instruction; for mildness qualified his earnest reproofs, and warm affection tempered his fiery zeal. At the age of thirty, he was ordained a priest, and at once took a prominent part in the ecclesiastical synods.

A bright prospect opened before him in his native land. His heart, however, had long burned to preach the gospel to the heathen on the continent; and having obtained the reluctant consent of his abbot, he sailed from London in 716, with two or three companions. They landed at Duerstede in Friesland, among a people who were skilled as sailors, and most jealous lovers of liberty, and barbarous to a proverb. They practised human sacrifices, fastening numerous victims at low water mark, that the raging sea might be appeased in devouring them. Their king Radbod was then waging a war with Charles Martel, fighting against baptism and Frankish despotism, which the Frieslanders regarded as the same thing. Boniface was obliged next year to go back to his convent in England, where the brethren would fain have made him abbot, the office being then vacant.

But the missionary work was too dear to his heart. He started, in 718, for Rome, where he was kindly received by pope Gregory II., with whom he spent the winter. Unlike the Irish, and old British, or Culdee, missionaries, he deemed it necessary to obtain a commission from the pope before commencing his work. After taking a solemn oath of canonical obedience to the Roman see, an oath which he faithfully kept to his dying day, he was fully empowered to enter the field. He commenced in Thuringia. But the anarchy prevailing there discouraged him; and hearing of the death of the savage king Radbod, his hopes for the Frisians revived, and he went back to that first field of his choice.

Here he wrought for three years with surprising success. Everywhere the idol temples fell, and churches arose, and multitudes were turned to the Lord. But when that eminent English missionary, Willibrord, bishop of Utrecht, would have designated him to be his successor, Boniface pleaded that the pope had sent him rather to other tribes in pagan Germany, to which he also fancied himself called in a night vision. In 722, he journeyed to Hessia, where he baptized Detwig and Dierolf, the *herzogs* of the country, as also great multitudes rescued by him from heathenish superstition, and founded the first monastery. Owing to the wars with the bordering Saxons, the country was so wasted, that he could get but scanty subsistence for himself and his companions. Having made a report of his labors to the pope, he was summoned to Rome in 723.

There, after a rigid examination, to make sure of his devotion to the papacy, he was ordained, *sine titulo*, as a missionary bishop to the Germans. Furnished with ample letters of credence from St. Peter's chair, commending him to the regard of emperors, kings, nobles, priests, and people, both Christian and heathen, Boniface returned to Germany in 724. After visiting Charles Martel, and securing his powerful protection, he returned to his work among the Hessians. From his letters written about this time, he appears to have been sorely thwarted and hindered by degenerate Frankish clergymen.

The superstitions of his pagan diocese he assailed with material force, as well as spiritual energy. The religion of the people attached itself very much to sacred groves and trees. At the village of Geismar, there was an immense oak, sacred to Odin. In the sight of a vast assembly, Boniface literally "laid the axe at the root of the old tree of superstition." He and his helpers hewed at it with a good will. And that the work might not seem to be done by human hands only, a strong gust of wind caught the tree-top, and it fell with a tremendous crash, and was broken in four parts. This bold deed was an ocular demonstration to the heathen of the nothingness of their gods; and to accommodate these new converts, a chapel was built of the wood of the fallen forest-king. Nor was this the only instance of the like boldness in Boniface.

From this region, he passed into Lower Saxony, the multitude of converts increasing every day, as well as the number of preachers of the word, most of whom labored for their own subsistence, while they prosecuted their mission. Here, also, he founded a cloister, as he did everywhere, to serve as a mission station and centre of activity. His principal helper thus far had been young Gregory, a youth of princely birth, who followed him to his death with devoted attachment. He now wrote to England for auxiliaries. From the year 725, the English cloisters sent forth into his vast harvest-field, a long succession of most zealous and self-denying men. Very many of these, in time, became bishops and abbots, and exerted a wide-spread influence.

In the year 731, when Gregory III. became pope, he made Boniface an archbishop with all the usual powers, but still without any particular see. Finding that wars and political tumults would not permit the extension of his efforts among the Saxons, he turned his activity southwards into Bavaria. Till now he had only been a reformer and a missionary. From this time he became the organizer of a great ecclesiastical hierarchy, in which business he showed himself an adept. At his first visit to Bavaria, he found himself unable to bring the independent bishops of the country into complete dependence upon the Roman see. Returning first to Hesse, he then made his third journey to Rome, attended by a large body of his disciples, Franks, Bavarians, and Britons. This visit lasted nearly a year, occupied in arranging his plans, and providing for their execution. In the spring of 739, he returned, clothed with full powers. He divided Bavaria into four dioceses, and filled them with bishops of his own stamp ; that is to say, strictly orthodox, moral, and devoted to the support of Romish ecclesiastical order. Many cloisters were founded at this time, which greatly helped the work of consolidation.

He next did the same thing in middle Germany, which he also divided into four episcopal sees, each supplied with a prelate of his school.

The death of the hero, Charles Martel, in 741, formed a new era in the life of Boniface. That rough old soldier was fonder, by far, of mauling with his ponderous mace the heads of Saracens and Saxons, than of playing into the

hands of astute churchmen. But his sons and successors—Carloman and Pipin—saw that the centralization of power in the church must help on the like centralization in the state, and they fell in with the schemes of the zealous Romanist. It is but just to Boniface to say, that his activity in this direction seems to have been prompted by the belief, that it was only by exalting the papal power, and bringing it to bear as a means of discipline, that he could correct the gross abuses which had crept into the churches of the Franks. The clergy, according to all his epistles, were wofully demoralized and corrupt—too far gone either to reform themselves, or to extend the gospel among their Pagan countrymen and neighbors. The main instrument of reform here, as elsewhere, in the previous centuries, was the holding of synods and provincial councils, where canons were adopted for the suppression of abuses. The first of these German synods, after they had been omitted for eighty years, was held in 742; and the canons adopted, abundantly show the low state of religion among the clergy and laity, and that there were numerous relics of heathenism still lingering in the churches, and requiring the most energetic measures to root them out. In many other synods, which appear to have been held quite statedly, Boniface was very active in the work of reforming and regulating the condition of the church in all that vast territory. At a synod held in 747, it was thought that the time had come to limit his archiepiscopal power to a particular field, and he was assigned to the archbishopric of Mainz, with five suffragans under him, and all the German nations whom his preaching had brought under the light of the gospel. That his success had been wonderful, appears by the fact, that eight years before this time, he had baptized nearly a hundred thousand Pagans.

We have seen this great man as a missionary and an ecclesiastical reformer—a business-man of the intensest activity. We find him no less distinguished for the opposite qualities of an ascetic and contemplative monk. Through his faithful follower Sturm, he had laid in the depths of the wooded wilderness the foundations of the renowned cloister of Fulda. To this lone and loved retreat he yearly retired for repose from his overwhelming cares; and there,

as he said, his bones should rest, in the midst of the four races—the Hessians, the East-Franks, the Thuringians, and the old Saxons, "to whom, with God's help, he had proclaimed the word of Christ." Even in the time of Sturm, its founder and first abbot, it numbered four hundred brethren, besides numerous novices and servants; and its rich endowments, given by princes and private persons, were scattered over all Germany. It became a great educational establishment, from which issued many of the ablest men of their time.

From his periodical retirements at Fulda, Boniface went back to his labors with renewed diligence. In the year 752, he anointed the famous Pipin to be sole king of the Franks. In a letter written to the pope in the same year, his delay in sending it is excused by his engagements in restoring not less than thirty churches, which had been burned by the Pagan Saxons. He had been archbishop of Mainz seven years, when the old man was seized with a strong desire to unite the last great action of his public life with the first, by returning to his earliest field of missionary labor in Friesland. Feeling that he had not long to live, he procured his countryman Lull, who had been his helper for twenty years, to be ordained as his assistant, and designated as his successor. He took measures for the continued support of his missionaries on the borders of Paganism, who were able, he says, by their industry, to furnish themselves scantily with bread, but not with clothing and other necessaries of life.*

His last missionary tour to Friesland was made in 755. He did not expect to return, and took his shroud with him in his book-chest. He was attended by a bishop, and priests, deacons, monks, and lay-servitors, to the number of fifty-two. They went down the Rhine to the Zuyder Sea, and traversed the country, baptizing thousands, and founding new churches. On the fifth of June, he was encamped at

* They were mostly Englishmen; and in their letters to England, they say, "God, in his mercy, has given good success to our labors, though they be dangerous and laborious in almost every respect, in hunger and thirst, and cold, and incursions of the Pagans."

Dockum, where he was to have held a confirmation that day. Early in the morning, instead of his spiritual children, there came a band of savage heathen, rushing towards his tents, and swearing that they would kill the enemy of their gods. His servants would have defended him, but he forbade. "Strive not!" he said; "the Scripture teaches us not to render evil for evil. Long have I desired this day. The time of my departure is at hand. Be strong in the Lord, and patiently bear what he sends. Trust in him, and he will save our souls." The clergymen went out of the tent one by one, and yielded themselves to death. Last of all, went Boniface, praying aloud, and, holding the gospels over his head, he received the death-stroke, being about seventy-five years of age. Erring in many things, he was yet a great man and a holy martyr.

His murderers quarrelled over their booty, and many of them mingled their life-blood with that of their victims. By Christian hands, the body of Boniface was borne to Utrecht, from thence to Mainz, and from thence, attended by vast multitudes, praying and singing, it was conveyed to Fulda, which he had chosen for his burial-place, and there, with sad solemnity, deposited under the great door of the cathedral. He was one of the few saints of the middle ages, to whom his biographers ascribe no miracles, except the healing of sin-sick souls. And this modesty of theirs is next to a miracle. He was a thorough-going upholder of the theocratic system of church unity and supremacy culminating in the Roman See; and carried, even to fanaticism, his opposition to the marriage of clergymen, which was still very common in his time. But he was a bold reprover of sin, whether in popes, in kings, or in angry mobs; and it was the chief labor and delight of his life to preach the gospel to the heathen, and gather his countless converts into the fold of Christ his Lord.

We now proceed to the third great missionary enterprise, which substantially completed the conversion of the Gothic races in Europe, and which received its chief impulse fifty years after the martyrdom of Boniface in the activity of the sainted Anschar.

He was born in 801, of respectable parentage, in the north of France. His mother, a godly woman, died when

he was five years old. From her he inherited a feeble frame, afterwards toughened by toil and hardship, a lively imagination, a tender heart, and a melancholy temperament. He was placed for his education in the celebrated monastery of Old Corvey, where none but the children of nobles were received, and trained for the higher offices in church and state. Here his mind was deeply moved by sundry remarkable dreams of a highly exciting character. Whatever occupied his waking thoughts seems to have been reproduced in his night-visions, in splendid symbolisms. The death of the great Emperor Charles, whom he had seen in all his glory, also powerfully impressed the sensitive boy. He gave up all childish sports, and addicted himself to study and devotion. He was not twelve years old when he took the monastic vows. In one of his magnificent dreams, he received, as he imagined, a divine promise, that the crown of martyrdom should be his. With this glorious consummation ever in view, he became indifferent to the world, and capable of the boldest undertakings, though his practical good sense, in which, with all his fancies, he was by no means wanting, kept him from tempting God, and provoking the martyrdom he coveted, by thrusting himself into needless dangers.

At the age of twenty, he became teacher and rector of the cloister-school, where he had studied under Paschasius Radbert, the originator of the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, in its Tridentine form. To promote the conversion of the Saxons, whom Charlemagne had with difficulty subdued, after shedding torrents of blood, a branch cloister, called New Corvey, was founded in Westphalia, on the left bank of the Weser, and, ere long, outshone the glory of the mother house. It became, in the culture of the north of Germany, what Fulda was to the middle, and St. Gall to the south. Here Anschar became the first rector of the cloister-school, and the first pastor of the cloister-church. He had not long been thus employed, when the door was opened for him into the missionary field.

The Emperor Louis inherited, from his father, Charlemagne, a zeal for converting his northern neighbors, which had in it as much of policy as piety. There was war in Denmark, for the succession to the crown. Harold, one of

the claimants, being worsted by his rivals, applied to Louis for help. He came with his wife and vassals, in a hundred boats, up the Rhine to the imperial court at Ingelheim. As the condition of the emperor's help, he and his retainers submitted to baptism, which was administered with great pomp and solemnity. Louis, doubtful of the firmness of his raw converts, was most anxious to furnish them with a faithful bishop. Anschar was named, who gladly accepted the difficult and dangerous office; and no reproach, nor ridicule, nor entreaty could dissuade him from his unpromising mission.

He could find but one of his brethren, Autbert, a man of noble birth, willing to go with him, so great was the fear of the wild Danes. Anschar was now in his twenty-fifth year. He was furnished by the emperor with everything necessary for his journey, and for the celebration of divine service. As they descended the Rhine, the two missionaries found but little comfort in their Danish neophytes, who knew not how to behave towards the servants of God. But at Köln, the Bishop Hadebald took pity on them, and gave them a fine vessel, with two convenient cabins. Harold was so much pleased with the vessel, that he must needs stay in it, and appropriated one of the cabins to himself. This was a happy circumstance; for, in the intercourse which arose, the engaging manners of Anschar completely won his heart.

Two years he toiled in Denmark, making many converts, and training many youths in a school he formed in Schleswig. But his patron Harold being again driven off by his enemies, he was obliged to leave the country; and Autbert soon after died of disease brought on by hardship and exposure. At this juncture, another door of access to the Gentiles was opened. Through commercial intercourse, some seeds of the gospel had been scattered in Sweden. The emperor hearing of this, proposed to Anschar to attempt this mission, and found him perfectly willing. In the year 829, leaving the monk Gislemar to look after the Danish mission, Anschar, with a few companions, sailed for Sweden. Assailed by pirates, who plundered them of everything, they were glad to escape with their lives to the shore. Nothing daunted by this reverse, Anschar pursued his way,

mostly on foot, and reached at last Birka Sigtuna, where lived the Swedish king, who received him kindly, and gave him leave to preach and baptize. One of the first converts, and a very sincere one, was the Jarl Herigar, a man of rank and influence, who became a firm supporter of the gospel, and built a church on his estates near Sigtuna. After a year and a half spent in preparing the way for the gospel, Anschàr returned to the emperor.

The monarch, to carry out his plans for the extension of Christianity in the north, founded and endowed an archbishopric at Hamburg, and sent Anschar to Rome, to be ordained by the Pope, who confirmed the arrangement. One Gozbert was made a bishop, and sent to take the oversight of the Swedish mission, where he wrought for many years with good success. But in the year 845, his house was attacked and plundered by a maddened mob of Pagans, and he was forced to fly the country.

Meanwhile Anschar was busy at Hamburg, doing what he could for the Danes, in the face of violent opposition. But about the time when the Swedish mission was broken up, Hamburg, with its elegant church and cloister, was laid in ashes by the piratical Northmen. When the man of God saw the fruit of so much toil consumed at once, he repeated the words of Job: "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord!" He found a refuge at Ramelsloh, on the estates of the noble lady Ida, in Holstein. He went everywhere over his wasted diocese, imparting instruction and comfort to the afflicted people. His friend, the emperor, was dead; his revenue from France cut off; many of his associates were forced, by poverty, to leave him; but this faithful shepherd would not forsake his sorrowing flock.

His affairs soon began to improve. About this time, Leuderich, Bishop of Bremen, died, and King Ludwig, of Germany, took measures to unite this diocese with that of Hamburg. This was effected, with some difficulty, in the course of a year or two; and Anschar, in 849, found himself much strengthened by the change, and better able to extend and support his mission-stations in the north. He succeeded in acquiring the confidence of Erick, King of Denmark, who had been a bitter enemy of the gospel, and gained his con-

sent to the introduction of Christian worship into any part of his dominions. There was soon a flourishing church at Schleswig. In 851, he sent Ardgar, a hermit, to take charge of the Swedish mission, which had been vacant seven years; but where the converts, encouraged by the pious Herigar, had adhered remarkably to the faith, and joyfully hailed the coming of a servant of Christ.

Ardgar, however, soon forsook this interesting field, being unable to resist his longings to return to his hermitage. Anschar applied to Gozbert, now Bishop of Osnabrück, to go back to Sweden, whence he had been driven by a popular tumult. But Gozbert referred this duty to Anschar himself, as a person far more likely to succeed in the attempt. The latter willingly adopted the suggestion, being further induced thereto, "by one of those visions which imaged forth the divine aspirations of his soul, and seemed to him to be from God." In 851, he set out on this journey, wherein he expected to win that crown of martyrdom for which he had looked with longing eyes from his youth upwards. He went as an envoy from King Ludwig, of Germany, and also from King Erick, of Denmark; and was attended by priest Erimbert, a nephew to Gozbert. They arrived in Sweden at a very unpropitious time. There was just then a strong popular reaction in favor of the ancient polytheism. Anschar's friends exhorted him to get away with his life while he could. This he utterly refused to do. Keeping himself very quiet, he took measures to conciliate the good will of King Olaf. The powers of the king being limited, he called an assembly of the people to decide the question whether Christianity should be tolerated. Anschar betook himself to prayer and fasting, till he felt a glow of inward assurance, that the grace of God would bring about a favorable decision. The matter was first discussed among the nobles; and on appealing to the lot, it resulted in favor of admitting the gospel. It was then debated with great heat in the popular assembly. But a very old man, arguing that many persons in dangers of sickness, war, and shipwreck, had gotten help by calling upon Christ, it was at last resolved to oppose no obstacles to the new religion. Anschar forthwith made the requisite arrangements, and, after a three years' stay, left Erinbert

in charge of the work, and returned, in 854, to his archiepiscopal abode in Bremen.

As one proof of his moral courage and moral power, we may mention that Anschar, hearing of certain fugitive Christians who had been reduced to slavery by some of his haughty chieftains, cheerfully went into the midst of them, collected the captives from every side, and no one venturing to oppose him, he immediately set them free. His humility was unfeigned. Far from aspiring to the reputation of a worker of miracles, he would say, when the sick came to him, entreating to be healed through his prayers—"Oh, if I were worthy in the sight of my God, I would indeed ask him to grant this one miracle, that his grace might make me a good man!"

Having wrought in the Lord's vineyard for thirty-four years, he died, after a distressing sickness of four months, at the age of sixty-four. He showed the greatest patience under his bodily pains, only regretting that his early dream of martyrdom was not to be fulfilled. Deep concern for the souls of his friends, of his flock, and of the heathen nations, filled his mind to the last. Having received the Holy Supper, and prayed for the forgiveness of all who might have wronged him, he expired with the words, "Lord, be merciful to me a sinner! Into thy hands I commit my spirit!"

We have now taken a cursory glance at this broad mission-field. We have seen what manner of Pagans peopled it, and what sort of missionaries attempted, with complete external success, this grand enterprise of evangelization. It occupied between six and seven centuries; and it is but about six hundred years since the whole of that important portion of the now civilized world embraced the religion of the cross. Let us close by instituting a brief comparison between this immense effort of propagandism, and our modern Protestant missions for the conversion of the heathen.

The *populations* to be converted then were very much like the less cultivated idolaters to be converted now. The various systems of idolatry being mostly traditional, and very ancient, are much alike in their main features, and in the spirit which animates them. Human nature, in this

manifestation of its depravity, is quite the same in all ages, and in all the parts of the world. Thus Boniface, in a letter written to rebuke the unchastity of Ethelbald, the Saxon king of Mercia, mentions that among the savage Wends, it was the custom of the widows to burn themselves on the funeral piles of their husbands, just as the Hindoo women did, till of late, in British India. There is scarcely any peculiarity in the Paganism of our times, which has not its parallel in that of the barbarous races of ancient Europe.

If we compare the *agents* in the older and the recent efforts at evangelization, the differences become very manifest. It would be interesting, if time permitted, to contrast Columban with David Brainerd, or Boniface with Dr. Judson, or Anschar with Henry Martyn. They might not prove much unlike in mental qualifications, in ardor of zeal, in patient sufferance of toil and privation, or in intense devotion to the saving of the heathen. Even their natural temperaments and their religious experience would be found to have much in common. For in those earlier ages, the moral theology of the Catholic Church, though sadly corrupted, had not so completely obscured the doctrine of justification as it afterwards did. The Augustinian doctrine still prevailed so far as to preserve the direct union of the believer, through faith, with Christ as his life. Christianity was not then wholly sunken into a mere church system, in which the clergy, with their ritualism, assume the place which belongs to the Redeemer.

Still the churchmen of those times cannot be classed together. The distinctions among them were far wider than now appear, ranging from the most exalted and austere piety, down to a thoroughly worldly and vicious life. By the side of the precise and rigid Boniface, we find Gewillieb, bishop of Mainz. His father, Gerold, was bishop of the same place before him, and was killed at the head of his troops in a battle with the Saxons. As soon as the afflicted son was ordained in his warlike father's place, he marched to avenge him. The Weser parted the two armies. Gewillieb sent his armor-bearer into the hostile camp, to learn the name of the Saxon who smote his father. The bishop then invited this man to an interview. They met in the river on

horseback. Gewillieb suddenly drew his sword, and stabbed the unsuspecting Saxon, exclaiming, as he dealt the blow, "Take this steel, which revenges my loved father!" The betrayed man fell from his saddle, and expired in the stream. With great difficulty, Boniface succeeded in sequestering this fierce and treacherous prelate from his spiritual duties, though he retained the revenues of his office. The secular clergy, that is to say, the bishops and parish-priests were, in general, quite illiterate, and very often grossly immoral. It was not from them, that the evangelizing of the pagans proceeded; but from the monks, and their cloister schools. Yet by far the greater part of these professed recluses stagnated amid a round of fruitless observances, which neither honored God nor benefited mankind. The few—for though numerous, they were comparatively few—who broke loose from this inglorious pietism, and devoted their lives so energetically for the conversion of the heathen, are deserving of the greater veneration. Our modern missionary brethren present a much more uniform type of character, and incomparably better understanding of their work, and training for it; but can scarcely exceed them in disinterested and self-denying zeal to win souls from dumb idols to the living God.

As respects the *means* employed, the old and the recent missions were in many things alike. Then as now, the first step was to win the consent of the pagan chiefs and princes to the residence of the missionaries. Then as now, almost the next step was to preach the gospel through the lips of an interpreter, as Oswald, the Northumbrian king, did for Aidan, bishop of Lindisfarne. Then as now, no time was lost in gathering the children and youth into schools, in hopes both of obtaining thence their earliest converts, and of training up from among them native preachers for the nascent churches. Compare the public instructions usually given to our missionary brethren on the eve of embarkation, with those of the celebrated Alcuin: "This course is to be pursued in teaching adults: First, Let them be instructed in the immortality of the soul, in the future life, in the awards of good and evil, and in the eternity of both conditions. Secondly, They should then be told for what sins and crimes they will have to suffer with the devil everlasting

punishments, and for what good deeds they will enjoy unending glory with Christ. Thirdly, The faith of the Holy Trinity is then to be most diligently taught, and the coming of our Saviour into the world for the salvation of the human race. Afterwards impress the mystery of his passion, the truth of his resurrection, his glorious ascension, his second coming to judge all nations, and the resurrection of our bodies.—Thus prepared and strengthened, the man may be baptized." Anschar was exceedingly solicitous that the missionaries sent out by him should show the utmost disinterestedness, asking nothing from any one, living like Paul by the labor of their hands, and content with food and clothing of the simplest kind. He, however, furnished them as liberally as he was able; and supplied them with presents that they might gain friends and patrons among influential men wherever they went. Several of those ancient missionaries translated the Scriptures, wholly or in part, into the languages spoken by those to whom they were sent; and encouraged their converts to read these versions, and to learn them by heart.

In many things, however, the old missionaries, like the Jesuits and other later Roman propagandists, yielded too far to the heathenish usages of their converts. Thus pope Gregory directs Augustine, when converting the English Saxons, who had been accustomed to sacrifice oxen to demons, and hold sacrificial feasts thereon, to conform so far as this; on occasions of special solemnity, to make booths of branches around the churches, and slay their beasts, not for the devil, but "to the praise of God in their eating, returning thanks to the giver of all things." A very dangerous concession! The Scandinavians were so addicted to drinking healths in honor of their gods, that the missionaries gave up the effort to abolish the practice, and taught them (let it be told with sorrow) to substitute Christ and the saints, whose healths they devoutly drank for many ages. This erroneous policy of conciliating the heathen by giving way to their inveterate habits is a very ancient innovation. "As early as the third century," says Coleridge, "the church had begun to paganize Christianity, under the pretext, and no doubt the hope, of christianizing paganism." Many of the old idol-temples, consecrated to Christian worship, re-

tained too much of their first odor. "It had been better," says Fuller, "to build new nests for the heavenly dove."

In looking at the comparative *results* of the ancient and modern systems, we perceive that the fathers made the more rapid progress, but the work was exceedingly superficial. Ten thousand ignorant Saxons baptized in one day, at the bidding of their king, were a far meaner monument of the power of the truth, than one soul truly enlightened and born from above. History is full of those hasty conversions, which were not even half conversions. They tell us of old king Radbod, the Frieslander, that he had one foot in the water, when he put the question to Bishop Wulfram, who was about to baptize him,—"Are my royal forefathers in heaven, or in hell?" The bishop replied,—"Doubtless in hell, for they died without the sacrament." The neophyte suddenly drew back his foot, and exclaimed,—"Let me rather be in hell with my kingly ancestors, than go to paradise with a pack of beggars." This hopeful catechumen must have had but a shallow preparation. Nor can we have a much better opinion of the piety of the great Chlovis, who, like Constantine, staked his conversion on a wager of battle. Hearing, in a sermon at church, of the insults heaped upon our Lord in Pilate's hall, his Gallic blood boiled at the recital; and drawing the huge two-handled sword which hung from his shoulder, Chlovis cried out with fierce energy, —"Si ego ibidem, cum Francis meis fuissem, injurias ejus vindicassem!" Another such example we find in Mieczylas I., king of Poland in 964. He became a Christian in order to win the hand of Dombrowka, daughter of the Duke of Bohemia, which country had lately gone over to the faith. He grew to be a zealous proselyte to the peaceful religion of his wife. But the nature of his zeal is too clearly revealed by an edict which he made, that when any portion of the gospel was read in church, the hearers should half-draw their swords, to attest their eagerness to fight in its defence! Louis, the son of Charlemagne, took a very lively interest in conversion-work; and went so far as to be quite free in his *largesse* to the initiated, to the no small detriment of their sincerity. Sometimes the candidates (candidati) were so numerous, that it was difficult to supply a sufficient number of the white dresses then worn in baptism. At one

of these solemnities, some linen of the clergy was cut up, and hastily sewed together ; and one of these extemporaneous garments was offered to a Northman chief. The son of Odin, disdainfully frowning, horrified the good priest by saying, " This is the *twentieth* time that I have come to be washed, and have always heretofore received the best white garments. This vile frock is only fit for a cowherd ; and if you cannot furnish a better, I renounce your Christianity."

No doubt, the bulky harvests of those old reapers, for want of threshing and winnowing, included a very large proportion of chaff. And yet, withal, there was much pure wheat, as we could easily prove by many bright examples, gathered safely into the garner of the Lord.

Those ancient laborers, most of whom have long been forgotten, did a great work. Never was the " plough-share of reform" driven through a harder or thornier field. But those worthies, though they too often only scratched the surface, having put their hand to the plough, looked not back ; nor did they rest till they had traced their furrows over that whole continent, and many of the isles of the sea. And who will say, that they were not fit for the kingdom of God, though with the good grain they unwittingly scattered the seeds of many superstitions and errors, which in after times yielded a rank crop of popery ? But let it be remembered, that the churches of the glorious Reformation were all of their planting ; and the truths that they preached lived in those churches, and at last conquered and thrust out the errors that had been ignorantly disseminated.

If God, by such instruments, was pleased to Christianize a continent, which, with its dependencies, has been ever since the grand seat and source of Christian civilization and religion,—if he did this through instruments, in many respects so poorly fitted for such apostolical work, and so scantily furnished with outward means and appliances,—what may we not hope from the labors of our Protestant missionaries, who are diffusing a heavenly faith, a pure morality, and a Scriptural discipline ; expending in the task the vigor of cultivated mind and enlightened ardent piety, aided by the vastly increased facilities of commerce, science, art, invention, and locomotion, all made contributory to

their wishes; who consolidate the power of the word spoken by the word printed, thus preaching to thousands whom they never see, and appealing to "the standing miracle of a Christendom, commensurate and almost synonymous with the civilized world!" Great times are coming. The kingdom of heaven is at hand. It will not take another six centuries to complete the evangelizing of such nations as still sit in darkness and the shadow of death. Even now the world is convulsed with the birth-pangs of a new era of regenerated humanity, and a population quickened with the eternal life of "the new man."

# CHURCH

# CALENDAR.

BY

MIGHILL H. BLOOD.

Bangor:
WHEELER & LYNDE, PRINTERS.
1856.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856, by
MIGHILL H. BLOOD,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Maine.

# CHURCH CALENDAR.

## INTRODUCTION.

The sacred writings present a series of three Ecclesiastical Administrations, *the Introductory and Formulary, the Christian and Arbitrary, the Christian and Liberal*; also, a series of Churches corresponding to them, whose historical names develop the characters of their respective missions—*the Abrahamic and Israelite, the Catholic and Roman, the Evangelical and Puritan*; each of the last two duads bearing the marks of the first, by which they may be recognized as legitimate successors, and though unlike in the characters of their missions, each inherits from the Abrahamic and Israelite like careers, and leads to the grand consummation promised to Abraham near thirty-eight hundred years ago, *the blessing of all nations through his seed.*

## PROGRAMME.

The Scriptures present three parent Churches, having the following appellations and epochs:

1. The Abrahamic Church, - - - - B. C. 1936
2. The Gentile Church, - - - - May, A. D. 30
3. Those men who had "the seal of God in their foreheads," (Rev. 9: 4.) - May, A. D. 1330

Each of the three parent Churches has given birth to an offspring Church, which becomes a spiritual kingdom and falls into the temporal bondage of a foreign power at the termination of 300 years from the epoch of the parent Church, as follows:

1. The Children of Israel at the death of Joseph, B. C. 1636
2. The Church of Rome at the date of the removal of the seat of Government from Rome to Constantinople, - May, A. D. 330
3. The Puritan Church, or the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay, at the date of their landing in Salem with a Charter from the king of England, - - - - - June, A. D. 1630

The Churches of the Hebrew and Christian dispensations accomplish eight Careers, which are either related, marked out, or alluded to in the scriptures; in accordance with which ecclesiastical and profane historians furnish much of the narratives of their Careers, with remarkable exactness, written as it were with the pen of inspiration. Infidels, Gibbon and Haine, as well as Christian writers, have carefully recorded the fulfillments of prophecy.

In the first Administration the Abrahamic Church and Israel her offspring become blended and are afterward known by the name of Israel, which extends her sovereignty over the earth of the old dispensation, (the nations of Canaan,) and accomplishes two Careers, an Ecclesiastical and a Temporal. At the termination of the Careers of Israel, the sceptre of Judah is subverted by the power of the spiritual seed of Abraham on account of the apostasy of Israel.

In the second Administration, the Jewish and the Gentile Churches become blended, and are known by the name of the Christian Catholic Church, which pursues and completes a Career partially accomplished by the Jewish Christian Church before their union. Unlike the Abrahamic Church in the former Administration, the Catholic Church retires into the wilderness for preservation at the time of the birth of her Offspring, the Roman Church; yet she fulfills her career through *the remnant of her seed, having the testimony of Jesus Christ,* (Rev. 12:17,) which she leaves upon the theatre of the world. Instead of the Mother Church *the remnant of her seed* becomes blended or associated with her Offspring, the Roman Church, and completes the prophecy in "*sackcloth*" which had been partially accomplished by the Mother Church before her retirement. The Roman Church extends her sovereignty over the earth, "rules all nations with a rod of iron," (Rev. 12: 5,) and accomplishes two Careers, an Ecclesiastical and a Temporal,—at the termination of which the "*woman*" breaks down the Roman Church on account of her apostasy.

In the third Administration, the seed of the woman having "*gotten the victory over the beast,*" the woman in the wilderness appears, and they become associated under the name of the Evangelical Church, which completes a Career partially accomplished by the seed of the woman before her appearance. In due time, the Evangelical Church becomes associated with her offspring, the Puritan Church, which has two Careers, extends the bounds of the Mother Church, and gives Republican Christian liberty to the entire world.

The Careers of the American, or Puritan Church, *the last of the series,* extend 300 years posterior to the termination of the Career of the Mother Evangelical Church, (Rev. 20,) and appear to have their termination at the battle of "Gog and Magog," (Rev. 20: 8, 9,) when the Lord destroys by fire from heaven an innumerable army hostile to his Saints, and opens a new order of things, which appears to be beyond the limits of time.

# FIRST ADMINISTRATION.

## ABRAHAMIC CHURCH.

History presents the Ecclesiastical events of the past as harbingers of the present, and a glorious future in the Christian world. The history of the past is the history of ourselves. In the past we were formed.—From the past we receive our commission. We are sprung from the womb of the past into a sphere of action, committed to us, not by a law of fate, which looks to no moral result, but by the law of a wise Providence, which wields the moral and physical energies of the world, and fills the earth with the glory of God.

Near four thousand years ago, a people became vitalized with the principle of salvation by the divine Spirit, which yet blesses the race of man and radiates his prospects. Through the power of this principle in the seed of Abraham, the Christian world has attained to mighty results, and the present promises a future harvest abounding in rich things. *A chain of periodical events* connected with the operation of this principle runs through the past lapse of near forty centuries, and passes through many centuries to come, diversified and rendered wonderful by the various stages of the Church in its several revolutions. "*God's hand is in History.*"

# ISRAEL.

## ECCLESIASTICAL CAREER.

| | TABLE. | B. C. | Years |
|---|---|---|---|
| Epoch. | Date of the removal of Jacob and his family from Canaan to the land of Goshen in Egypt, one thousand seven hundred and six years before Christ, according to the epoch of the vulgar Christian Era, - - - - - - | 1706 | |
| Captivity. | Period of the sojourn of the Children of Israel in Egypt, a land of idolatry, hostile to their religion, under the jurisdiction of Joseph, a ruler from among themselves, (and therefore in possession of temporal comforts,) terminated at his death, - - - - - - - - | 1636 | 70 |
| Blindness. | Period of their sojourn in Egypt during the absence of Moses, their deliverer, from the date of their rejection of him until his return from Midian, 40 years, (Acts 7 : 25, 30,) *synchronal.* | | |
| Millennium. | Period from the death of Joseph, comprising the periods of their rise to power and glory, and declension into idolatry, for which God said (2d Chron. 34 : 24,) *he would bring evil upon them*—terminated about - - - - | 636 | 1000 |
| | Vacancy equivalent to the following periods: | | |
| | Bondage by Antiochus from B. C 167 to B. C. 164, - - - 3½ years | | |
| | Bondage in Egypt subsequent to the Career, about - - - 1½ year | | |
| | Sum connected with the Period of bondage below, - - 5 years | | |
| | Termination of the vacant period, - - | 631 | |
| Reform. | Period of reform and repair of the temple of Jerusalem by Josiah, terminated at his death, | 610 | 21 |
| Progress. | Period from the death of Josiah B. C. 610, exclusive of the period of absence during the Babylonian Captivity in the Temporal Career, 70 years,—terminated at the epoch of the bondage of the priesthood in Egypt, - - - - | 149 | 391 |
| Bondage. | Periods of bondage stated above 5 years<br>Period of bondage of the priesthood in Egypt, from B. C. 149, terminated at the date of the coming of Shiloh, "the prince of peace," B. C. 4, - 145 yrs | | 150 |
| | *Formal* ecclesiastical worship, until the termination of the temple millenium, A. D. 70. | | |

EPOCH AND DATES.—The notation of the removal of Jacob in the Table agrees with Usher's date, as found in the English Bible, yet it denotes more time. The dates in this Calendar, in the Careers of Israel, signify not current but entire years, and generally agree with Usher's figures.

CAPTIVITY.—The difference of 1 year between the date of the death of Joseph in the Table, and that in the English Bible, 1635, is unimportant, as Usher's dates can be viewed only as approximations to the true dates, upon the consideration that the fractional parts of years pertaining to periods are not always stated in the Hebrew narrative, and are therefore not taken into account in the computation of dates by interpreters.

BLINDNESS.—This Period being concurrent with a part of the Millennium, and a *synchronal* Period,* makes no addition to the duration of the Career, and is therefore not carried into the column of Periods in the Table. The characteristic of this Period denotes their spiritual state.

MILLENNIUM.—Joseph at his death informed the children of Israel that *God would visit them and bring them out of Egypt*, (Gen. 50 : 24,) and they thenceforth looked to God as their ruler. His special government as the king of Israel continued until B. C. 1095, the termination of 541 years from the epoch of this Period, when Israel under an impulse of infatuation became restless and desired a king from among themselves. And the Lord gave them a king according to their request; yet he commended it not, (1 Sam. 8 : 5—9, and 12 : 12.) For the remainder of the Period, 459 years, the kings of Israel and Judah reigned.

The Lord suspended the evil he threatened upon Judah at the termination of this Period, until Josiah's death, on account of his righteousness.

REFORM.—Josiah is said (2 Chron. 34,) to have commenced the work of purging the land from idolatry in his "twelfth year"—or after eleven years of his reign had passed;—also, it is said that he reigned 31 years—that *he repaired the temple*, using the funds in the keeping of Hilkiah the high priest, and his agency (2 Kings : 22,)—and that "when Josiah had prepared the temple," he went into battle with Necho, king of Egypt, and was killed. To the period of reform comprised between these two dates, 20 years, 1 year for preparatory work is added in the computation by the writer, from the example of a year of preparation in the corresponding Period of the Temporal Career.

The date of Josiah's death, at the termination of this Period, was the epoch of a period of great calamity to the Jews, the evil which God had threatened. "With Josiah," says Prideaux, "perished all the glory, honor and prosperity of the Jewish nation."

*A Period always concurrent with some other Period or Periods.

It is worthy of notice, that Josiah and Cyrus, the two restorers of Israel and the temple of Jerusalem, were predicted and called by name by the prophets many ages before they lived.

PROGRESS.—This is a period of progress towards a new Era, opened by the re-appearance of the King of Israel,—an ecclesiastical or spiritual king, according to the characteristic of this Career.

BONDAGE.—Towards the close of the Progressive Period, Judah was severely scourged 3½ years, Jerusalem laid waste, and the daily sacrifice taken away by Antiochus,* "*the vile person*," predicted by Daniel, (Dan. 11: 21—31.) The bondage of the priesthood and the child Jesus in Egypt after his birth, appears to have been a year or more from the command of Herod to slay all the children of Bethlehem from "two years old and under," as a considerable portion of this time must have passed between his birth and the date of Herod's order, which led him to the limit of *two years* in the age of the children. On account of the irregular occurrence of these two periods, (amounting to 4½ to 5 years,) the former conjunctively with another Period, as has been stated, and the latter subsequently to the Career, an equivalent allowance or blank period of time is substituted, thereby preventing an abbreviation of the time of the Career.

Onias, son of Onias 3d, and heir to the pontificate of Jerusalem in direct lineal descent, fled to Egypt in consequence of the assassination of his father and substitution of another person in his place. He built a temple in Egypt B.C. 149, like the temple of Jerusalem, by a license from Ptolemy and Cleopatra. In this act he professed to fulfil the prophecy in the 19th chapter of Isaiah, "*In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt.*" There were in this Period many Jews living in Egypt, and divine service was daily carried on in this temple by the priests and Levites.† Such was their history at the close of this Career, B.C. 4, 145 years from the date of the erection of the temple. This period of the temple service of the priesthood of Israel, under the government or yoke of a foreign prince and in a foreign land, was accordingly a period of ecclesiastical bondage.

According to the preceding references, the whole time of ecclesiastical bondage in this Career was 150 years.

In anticipation of the period of the subsequent bondage of the child of Mary in Egypt, stated above, the infant Christian Church appears in the person of its founder and high priest, Jesus Christ. He is soon carried into Egypt, where he becomes locally connected with the Jewish people and priesthood in ecclesiastical bondage, whence he is returned at the termination of about 146½ years from its epoch. Then was fulfilled the prophecy, "*Out of Egypt have I called my son*"—that is, out

* Prideaux' Connexions, B. C. 167.
† Prideaux' Connexions, B. C. 149.

of the bondage of Egypt. In the fulfillment of this event Christ also appears as a prophet like unto Moses (Deut. 18 : 18,) and comes as did Moses out of Egypt. Thus, in accordance with the ancient order of things in the Careers of Israel, the Christian Church and its priest and prophet come out of Egypt. By virtue of his descent from David, Christ appears also as its king—a spiritual king according to the import of this Career.

The thing signified by the ceremonial worship of Israel having appeared, the ecclesiastical Career of Israel is therefore ended. Accordingly the ritual worship of the Jews from this date is only *formal.*

## TEMPORAL CAREER.

| TABLE. | | | | B. C. | Years |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Epoch. | Date of the death of Joseph, the epoch of their bondage in Egypt, - - - - | | | 1636 | |
| Bondage. | Period of bondage to Egypt—terminated at the crossing of the Red Sea, | | 145 | 1491 | |
| | Vacancy equivalent to the following periods: | | | | |
| | Bondage of Simeon by Joseph prior to the removal of Jacob into Egypt, about - - - - - - | 1½ yr | | | |
| | Bondage of oppression by Pharaoh Necho, after the death of king Josiah from B. C. 610 to B. C. 607—about - - - - - - | 3½ yrs | | | 150 |
| | Sum connected with the period of bondage above, - - - - | 5 yrs | 5 yrs | | |
| | Termination of the vacant period, - - - | | | 1486 | |
| Wandering. | Period of wandering in the wilderness after the crossing of the Red Sea, 40 years, *synchronal.* | | | | |
| Progress. | Period Progressive—terminated at the inauguration of Saul as king of Israel, (in the time of the wheat harvest,) - - - - - - | | | 1095 | 391 |
| Captivity. | Period of Captivity by the king of Babylon (succeeding the Period of oppression by Necho) from the third year of Jehoiakim, B. C. 607, (in the month of November,) - - - | | | | 70 |
| Restoration. | Period of Restoration and rebuilding the temple which was completed and dedicated on the 3d of Adar, (February,) B. C. 515, - - - | | | | 21 |
| Millennium. | Period from the inauguration of Saul, exclusive of the periods of Captivity and Restoration—terminated at the coming of Shiloh, (in the month of September,) - - - - - - - | | | 4 | 1000 |
| | Form of nationality until the termination of the temple millennium, A. D., 70. | | | | |

EPOCH.—The date of the epoch of the bondage of the children of Israel, according to an Analysis of the Careers of the Church, must be at the termination of 300 years from the call of Abram from the land of Ur. The date of his birth being B. C. 1996, according to Usher, and his age at the date of his call 60 years, according to the careful computation of *Abulfaragi*,* (whom Dr. Hales considers the most critical authority,) consequently the epoch of this Career is B.C. 1636.

BONDAGE.—After the death of Joseph the Israelites lived under the government or yoke of Egypt—a condition of bondage because it was the government of a foreign prince—or, according to the sacred writings, they were always in bondage in their early ages whilst living in strange lands (Acts 7 : 6.) Yet, under the jurisdiction and protection of Joseph whilst governor of Egypt before this period, there was probably no abridgement of temporal privileges, for he promised them "the good of all the land of Egypt" before their removal from Canaan.

The retention of Simeon in bonds by the command of Joseph before the removal of Jacob to Egypt was necessarily a cause of a sore affliction of the family and therefore composed a part of their Egyptian bondage. Its time appears to have been more than a year from the words of Joseph, "for these two years hath the famine been in the land,"—and in consideration of the two journeys of Jacob's sons into Egypt to buy corn, between which the lapse of about a year probably intervened.

The oppression of the Jews by Necho from the date of Josiah's death B.C. 610, in the month of July according to *Jarchi*,† (who says there was an annual lamentation for Josiah on the 9th of Ab,) terminated at the epoch of the Babylonian captivity B. C. 607,‡ in the month of November,§ was also a period of Egyptian bondage—near 3½ years.

The binding of Simeon having occurred prior to the Career, and the period of bondage by Necho in synchronism with another Period, a blank period or substitution of an equivalent, about 5 years, succeeds the Period of bondage first stated.

PROGRESS.—The termination of this Period must have been at the date of the inauguration of Saul at Mizpeh, or at the date of his confirmation at Gilgal soon afterwards in the time of the "wheat harvest," (1 Sam. 12 : 17,) which takes place in Judea about the month of May.

CAPTIVITY.—Prideaux and others place the epoch of the Captivity in the fourth year of Jehoiakim,—but this disagrees with the statement of Daniel, who, (as Dr. Hales says in his Analysis,) is the best authority, and it is placed in the Table in the third year of Jehoiakim, as stated by the prophet (Dan. 1 : 1,2,) B.C. 607.

RESTORATION.—According to Dr. Prideaux the Jews were released from captivity by Cyrus exactly at the termination of seventy years,

*Hale's Analysis of Chronology, Vol. 2d, p. 108.
†Dr. Gill's Exposition.
‡See Captivity. §Prid. Con. B.C. 606.

which took place, according to its epoch, as found above and in the Table, in November B.C. 537; and the first company of them who returned reached Judea in the month of Nisan, (which answers to our March,) four months after the termination of the captivity. They arrived in Judea a few days before the passover,* (B.C. 536.)

After about a year's preparation, the Jews, under the superintendence of Zerubbabel, commenced the work of rebuilding their temple, which, on account of the opposition of the Samaritans and Artaxerxes a successor of Cyrus, was protracted. The house was completed in the sixth year of Darius (Ezra 6: 15,) which according to Prideaux was the year B.C. 515, who computes the period of the work to be just 20 years; to which however he makes room for the addition of another year by reason of his error of 1 year in the epoch of the captivity as shown above. The Period of rebuilding the temple appears then to have been 21 years. It was finished and dedicated as is shown by the statement of Ezra, a few days before the passover (B.C. 515.)

Millennium.—This Period, the balance of the Career, computed from the inauguration of Saul to the birth of Christ, exclusive of the Periods of Babylonian captivity and restoration, 91 years and four months, comprises two divisions, 459 years and 541 years.† In the computation of this Period, the Temporal Period of bondage, 3½ years, having occurred conjunctively with another Period and its time made up by an equivalent, is therefore not subtractive. The first division of the Millennial Period, 459 years, is the period of the power and glory of the Hebrews in the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah‡—the second, 541 years, is the period of their decline to the termination of their Career at the coming of Shiloh, according to the prophetic declaration of Jacob, (Gen. 49: 10.) And at the appearance of Christ, through the all-engrossing power of Archelaus, Herod's successor, Judah's dominion ceased.

After the departure of the sceptre of Judah, the Jews held a form of nationality, but powerless, until the termination of the period of the temple 1000 years, A.D. 70.

The termination of the Millennial Period, computed from the inauguration of Saul B.C. 1092, in the month of May, indicates the date of the birth of Christ in the year called B.C. 5—in the month of September preceding B. C. 4, as noted in the Table.

* Prid. Con. B.C. 536.

†After the revolt of the ten tribes at the end of the reign of Solomon, and the division of the Israelites into the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah, Israel became extinct in less than three hundred years, and the remainder of the Careers of Israel was fulfilled by Judah.

‡ At the termination of this division of the Millennial Period, the Jews were fallen under the curse of God, (2 Kings, 21: 12, and 2 Chron. 34: 24,) the execution of which however he suspended during the reign of Josiah on account of his personal piety, and, (as appears from their history,) for the fulfillment of the Period of external Reform in their Ecclesiastical Career. This Reform was essentially *external*, for they returned to idolatry as soon as Josiah died.

# SECOND ADMINISTRATION.

The Careers of Israel are the basis of the Careers of the Churches in the Christian era in the following regulated form, except the first Career of the Christian Church, which is somewhat irregular.

| | FORMULA. | YEARS. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| First. | Period of bondage under the yoke of a foreign power, | 146½ | |
| | Subsequent Period of bondage and oppression by a foreign power, | 3½ | |
| | Whole time of bondage, | | 150 |
| Second. | Period in an unsettled state or ecclesiastical blindness attended with trial and perplexity, succeeding the termination of the first period of bondage —40 years—*synchronal.* | | |
| Third. | Period in captivity or exile, succeeding the Periods of bondage, from which the Church is released by a sovereign who appears and adopts their cause at the termination of the captivity, | 70 | |
| Fourth. | Period of restoration, comprising a construction of the temple, | 21 | |
| | Both Periods *synchronal**—sum, | 91 | |
| Fifth. | Period of progress, succeeding the Periods of bondage, and terminating at the date of the epoch of the Church in a Regal state, or in its dissolution at the opening of a new Era, | | 391 |
| | Millennial Period — affixed in a Career of the Christian Church, and prefixed and affixed in the Careers of an Offspring Church in like manner as those of Israel. | | |

Note.—The disciplinary Periods are preparatory for subsequent prosperity.

* The Periods of Captivity and Restoration synchronize with the first 91 years of the Period of progress.

# CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

## FIRST CAREER.

### TABLE.

| | | DATES. | | YEARS. | DOUBLE CAREER. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Jewish Periods. | Gentile Periods. |
| | | | | | YEARS. | YEARS. |
| EPOCH. | Date of the building of the Jewish temple in Egypt by Onias, - - - | B. C. | 149 | | | |
| BONDAGE. | Period of the expatriation and ministry of the high-priest in Egypt—terminated at the coming of Christ out of Egypt, (Mat. 2: 23,) - - - - | B. C. | 3 | 146½ | 150 | |
| | Period of the persecuted ministry of Christ in the land of Judea—terminated at the date of his resurrection, - - - - - - - - - - - - | A. D. | 30 | 3½ | | |
| CAPTIVITY. | Period of the captivity, or sojourn of Christ and his followers in Egypt and Judea hostile to Christianity, from January 2d, B. C. 4, (exclusive of the Period of the ministry of Christ,) terminated at the date of the cessation of "perpetual sacrifice" in the temple,* the date of the coming of the "Son of man" with regal power, and destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. 24,) signified by the first "*earthquake*"† in the Christian era, (Rev. 6: 12,) July 17, A. D. 70. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Time of captivity on former page, - - - - - - - - - - - | | | 70 15 days | | |
| JUDAICAL BLINDNESS. | Period of the absence of Christ, (the prophet like unto Moses,) from the date of his ascension A. D. 30, until his return to deliver his people, and lead them into the kingdom of God‡ at the date of the destruction of Jerusalem, 40 years. | | | | 91 15 days | 91 15 days |
| RESTORATION. | Period from the breaking down of Judaical Christianity at the destruction of Jerusalem to the completion and establishment of the principles and code of Catholic Christianity, under the superintendence of St. John, - - - - - - - | | | 21 | | |
| Gentile Period. | Period from the rise of the Gentile Church, May 14th, A. D. 30, to the epoch of the Christian Roman empire, at the date of the dedication of Constantinople to God by Constantine, signified by the second earthquake, (Rev. 8: 5,) May 11th, - | A. D. | 330 | | | 300 |
| PROGRESS. | Period from the epoch of the Captivity, January 2, B. C. 4, exclusive of the Periods of John Baptist's and Christ's ministry, 7 years, to the date of the division of the Roman empire into two wings, the eastern and western empires, January 17th, - | A. D. | 395 | | 391 15 days | |
| | Gentile Period of Progress,—sum of the periods above in last column, - - | | | | | 391 15 days |
| MILLENNIUM. | Period from the second "*earthquake*" to the *fall of the star*, (Rev. 9: 1,) May 10th, | A. D. | 1330 | | | 1000 yrs. |

Synchronized with the Period below.

Progressive and additive to the Period below.

* Horn's Introduction.
† National revolution.
‡ *Spiritually*—according to the import of this Career.

The Careers of the Christian Church are of an ecclesiastical or spiritual character, attended with temporal discipline and blessings.

Epoch and Bondage.—By an inversion of two Periods in the Ecclesiastical Career of Israel, the long Period of bondage and the progressive Period, Christ appeared at the beginning of the Christian era, through the pre-established ecclesiastical course of things, as the representative and spiritual father of Israel in her Christian Career, and as her prophet, priest and king; and having come out of *the bondage of Egypt*, that Period became consequently a connecting link between the two dispensations, to either or both of which it may appertain, (the high priest of Israel having represented Christ in his sacerdotal office,) and is therefore the first Period in this Career of the Christian Church. The period of the ministry of Christ was just 3½ years.*

Captivity and Judaical Blindness.—January 2d, four years before January 2d A.D. 1 in the Christian era, is here adopted as the epoch of the captivity of Christ, because of its adaptation to the computation of periods corresponding to the given periods and plan of computation in the Apocalypse. The epoch of the captivity is supposed to be the date of the removal of the child Jesus to Egypt by Joseph and Mary to elude Herod's pursuit of him to take his life. He was under the captivity of Herod as well as in Egyptian bondage during his expatriation, because he was in Egypt on account of the hostility of Herod.

This Period of the Jewish Christian Church in connection with ancient Israel 70 years, together with the year or more of bondage ulterior to the termination of the Careers of Israel, amounting to about 71½ years, corresponding to the like periods of 70 years and 1½ year in the Ecclesiastical Career of Israel prior to their Temporal Career exhibits a curious connection of Israel with the Abrahamic and Christian ages—a spiritual bond as it were amalgamating the three churches.

The Periods of captivity, 70 years, and trial and perplexity, 40 years, were signified by our Lord in his declaration a short time before his crucifixion, (A.D. 30,) that those afflictions (the first of which had begun with his life,) would continue until *the coming of the Kingdom of God* at the passing away of that generation, a period of 40 years in Jewish history. In the latter Period the Jewish Christian Church were infected with a spirit of unbelief in the entire efficacy of the blood and sacrifice of Christ for the remission of sin, and on account of their spiritual blindness, like that of their fathers in discrediting the commission of Moses in a correspondent Period, (Acts 7: 25,) they adhered to the ritual worship of the old Church—their minds were so mystified by a veneration for the ancient order of things, that they beheld not the full power of their deliverer, so long as they lived under the shadow of their temple, to which their ancestors had for ages looked for the power of salvation.

* Prid. Con. A.D. 30.

RESTORATION AND OPENING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—At this point of the prophetic history of the Church by our Lord, terminating at the date of the destruction of Jerusalem, (Matt. 24,) he suspends its continuation to a subsequent day, when he appears to St. John in a vision at the Isle of Patmos, and after reviewing the state of the seven churches of Asia, he proceeds with the relation of events; presenting first, (in the 4th and 5th chapters of Revelation,) a symbolic exhibition of the organization of *the kingdom of God* which had then come, as foretold, (Matt. 24,) attended with the rejoicing of the angels and all the tribes of men*—an emblematic presentation of associated events in the 6th chapter, comprising the destruction of Jerusalem in the sixth seal, and *the gathering of the elect from "the four winds,"* (Matt. 24: 31,) in the 7th chapter, consisting of an assemblage (or union) of the two churches, the Jewish Christian Church, called *a hundred and forty-four thousand of the children of Israel*, sealed in their foreheads, and the Gentile Church, "*a great multitude which no man could number of all nations and people*,"—called in the expository prophecy (which commences with the 11th chapter,) "*the two candlesticks*" (symbolic names of churches, Rev. 1: 20,) which, in association with their oil or light bearers, the two Testaments, (*the law of God and the testimony of Christ, symbolized by the "two olive trees,"*) are also called "*the two witnesses*"—a social alliance, either two acting in and with the power of its associates, and thus accomplishing *the triumphs of the gospel.* These are the quadruple alliance in the 7th chapter, the "four angels" holding the winds to hurt the earth, being commissioned according to the exposition (Chap. 11,) to hurt their enemies, and also with power "to shut heaven," *(hold the winds,)* or terminate national elevation; (and accordingly, the great effort of the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70, to re-establish their nationality, was unavailing.) Well says Thomas Brightman, an English expositor of the 17th century, "we do gather and judge, that these two prophets [the two witnesses] are the Holy Scriptures, and the assemblies of the faithful; there is no man that may not at the first sight behold, how fit both of these are for this office of being witnesses."

The ritual temple service was not relinquished by the Jewish Christian Church until the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, which took place at the epoch of the construction of their new temple indicated by the end of their Captivity at the same date, *the temple of God* alluded to in the 7th chapter, (Rev. 7: 15,) a temple upon a Catholic basis, (for the Gentile Church is represented as serving God in it,) and without rituals, Christ having executed in his own person at Calvary the rites of his religion "*once for all.*" Though without rituals, yet like the other temple which was its shadow it *contains* the *rites*—else it cannot be a temple of

* The gospel had then been preached to "*every creature*," according to St. Paul. (Col. 1: 23.)

God. This temple, as capacious as the world, for it holds all the elect "*day and night*," is manifestly *the Faith or Creed* of the united Churches —for this is the only structure within the power of the Christian Church to form, according to the genius of its religion, *containing the sacrifice for sin*. Its construction and establishment under the superintendence of St. John, (upon whom as the only living apostle at that period devolved the chief office of building up the Church,) appear from the types to have been a work of 21 years. Accordingly, John having been the agent in this work, (like Hilkiah or Zerubbabel in the Careers of Israel,) he is required by our Lord in the expository prophecy (Chap. 11 : 1,) to render a measurement of it and its worshippers, who are found to be the two Churches or "candlesticks." From the date of the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70,) signified by the first earthquake in the Christian era at the opening of the sixth seal, after which they are represented as associated, (Chap. 7,) they "prophesy" or publish the word of God, in a united body.

NOTE.—The second prophecy, which is expository of the first, comprises other history concurrent with that of the first—and they synchronize and run together from the termination of the Jewish dispensation to the termination of the Roman Church, and opening of the era of the reign of Christ "*one thousand years*," (Rev. 20.)

PROGRESS.—In this Career there are two Progressive Periods towards the regal state, a Gentile and a Jewish Period, both commencing at the same date, (January 2, A. D. 4.) The first comprises the periods of Captivity and construction of the temple, 91 years and 15 days, and the Period of 300 years from the rise of the Gentile Church at the date of the command of Christ "*to preach the gospel to all nations*" (May 14th, A. D. 30,*) terminating at the date of the dedication of Constantinople to God by Constantine as the capital of his empire, (May 11th, A. D. 330,†) by which he changed his dominions, of which he was the spiritual as well as temporal king, from a pagan to a Christian kingdom, which is signified by the second earthquake (Chap. 8 : 5.)

The Gentile Church, by a system of exchange with the Jewish Church acquires spiritual dominion, and, being primitive like the Abrahamic becomes the parent of an Offspring Church under the dominion of a spiritual king, at the termination of 300 years from her epoch. At the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, she opened her doors to the Jewish Church, driven from her land to which alone she had a title by the deed of the Lord to Abraham, (Gen. 17 : 8,) and became associated with her as a partner in her Careers. She gave her the world and received in return the ecclesiastical temporalities of the seed of Abraham. Hence, the part of the Progressive Period which would synchronize with the

* The date of Christ's ascension.
† Rees' Encyclopedia.

Periods of Captivity and Restoration in this Career by a regular computation, equal to 91 years and 15 days, appears to be attached to the Gentile Period of 300 years terminating at the date of the birth of the Offspring of the Gentile Church, and their sum 391 years and 15 days, to form a Progressive Period entitling the Gentile Church at its termination to the right of a spiritual kingdom. Accordingly the two Churches appeared "in heaven," (Rev. 12,)—at the government of the empire of the world, as a mother church, (May 11th, 330,) undividedly entitled to spiritual dominion over the pagan nations of the earth, by virtue of *one* of the parties composing the mother Church, and gave birth to their Gentile Offspring, the Church of Rome, which Constantine erected into a State Church. The two Churches had a partial claim to the spiritual dominion of the world, and Constantine *partially* subdued paganism.

The Jewish Progressive Period, running from the same date as the other, as before stated, and exclusive of both the periods of the ministry of John the Baptist and Jesus Christ, just 3½ years each,* terminates at the date of the division of the Roman empire into "*two wings*," the eastern and western empires, by Theodosius the Great, January 17th, 395,† just 391 years and 15 days.

The ministry of the herald of Christ applies only to the Jewish Church —the Gentile being primitive like the Abrahamic has no precursor. The office of John was to proclaim the coming of the Lord to the Jews, and the time of his ministry must therefore be subtractive from the Progressive Period, the epoch of which is *after* the advent of Christ.

The edicts of Theodosius, in harmony with the right of the Christian Church to complete spiritual dominion at the termination of this Period, extirpated paganism. "Now was extinguished," says Weber, "the sacred fire of Vesta—the oracles and sybils were silent—and the pagan pantheism yielded to the faith of the crucified Savior."

Millennium.---From the date of the association of the two Churches, contemporary with the occurrence of the first earthquake, A. D. 70, "the two witnesses," according to the exposition (Chap. 11,) *prophesy in sackcloth for a period of* 1260 *years.* This period comprises a *period* intervening between the first and second earthquakes, 260 years, and the Millennial Period which follows; in the first of which the witnesses executed their office under the severe opposition of pagan governments. In the reign of Constantine at the epoch of the Millennial Period, though he had become a convert to Christianity and protected the Churches, yet by reason of his building up the Roman State Church, *the woman clothed with the sun*, (the two candlesticks having become a mother Church,) was not relieved from her habiliments of lamentation. Constantine yet retained the pagan exercise of lordship in spiritual things, (the dragon was

* Prid. Con.
† Clarke's Commentary.

at court as well as the woman,—Rev. 12 : 3,) and assumed from the first absolute authority in ecclesiastical affairs,—as is instanced in his commanding the admission of Arius (A. D. 330,) into the communion of the orthodox Church, which, though prevented by an act of providence in the death of Arius on his way to the church, gives evidence of the arbitrary prerogative of the emperor. The woman, (by whom may be understood the various sects of the orthodox faith at that day, called *Puritans* in the Romish history, the principal of whom were the Novatians,*) overborne by the power of the Church and State establishment which required uniformity, retired into obscurity—"fled into the wilderness," for safety, (Rev. 12 : 6,) to remain 1260 years, and left upon the public theatre of the world her Offspring Church under the dominion of the king, and "the remnant of her seed" blended with the Church of Rome and in possession of "the testimony of Jesus Christ," (Rev. 12 : 17,) which fulfilled in sackcloth the millennial prophecy of this Career."†

"*There was war in heaven*," a struggle between paganism and Christianity. The dragon pursued the woman for a short period, who though in the wilderness was not yet in deep obscurity. Meanwhile, through the rising power of the Roman Church, paganism gave way and eventually disappeared under the severe ordinances of Theodosius, the dragon became enraged, and the woman, after the death of the emperor which took place January 17, 395, fled from the wrath of the dragon, to the place of her seclusion in the wilderness for 1260 years upon "*the two wings of an eagle*," symbolizing the Roman empire, which Theodosius divided at his decease into the eastern and western Roman empires to make thrones for his two sons, Honorius and Arcadius. An inundation of pagans followed, which came rushing in great hordes towards Rome the very year of the death of Theodosius—*the vomit of the dragon*, (Rev. 12 : 15,) to drown the woman. After which he turned his warfare against "the remnant of her seed" publicly fulfilling the prophecy of this Career, the remainder of which was indeed a prophecy in sackcloth, amid the enormous corruptions of Christianity arising from the flood of the dragon.

*The fall of the star*, (Rev. 9 : 1,) marks the termination of this Period and end of this Career, which took place May 10, 1330, as will be shown in the Ecclesiastical Career of the Roman Church, 1000 years from the second earthquake, signifying the end of the pagan Roman empire at the date of the dedication of Constantinople to God by Constantine, May 11,

* So named from Novatus, the pastor of an orthodox Church in Rome in the middle of the third century.

† In like manner as Judah accomplished a long period of the Career of Israel.

330. There was manifestly no other public millennial prophecy, than that accomplished by the remnant of the seed of the woman, in this Career, for she herself was in the wilderness until after its termination secluded from public affairs.

A brief narrative of the Church in the wilderness is subjoined to the Calendar in an Appendix.

## ROMAN CHURCH.

### ECCLESIASTICAL CAREER.

| TABLE. | | A. D. | Years |
|---|---|---|---|
| Epoch. | Date of the second earthquake (Rev. 8: 5,) May 11, | 330 | |
| Millennium. | Period from the rise of the Christian Roman empire denoted by the *second earthquake*, comprising the progress of the Roman Church to ecclesiastical power and glory and its declension into idolatry, terminated at *the fall of the star*, (Rev. 9: 1,) May 10, - - - - - | 1330 | 1000 |
| Bondage. | Period of spiritual bondage in the worship of idols from the fall of the star to the loosing of the "four angels" at the sounding of the sixth trumpet, "*five months*," (Rev. 9 : 10,) terminated, - | 1480 | 150 |
| Progress. | Period of conflict with the four angels, "an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year," terminated in the dissolution of the idolatrous Church, | 1871 | 391 15 days |

The genealogy of this Offspring Church at the termination of 300 years from the rise of its parent *Gentile* Church has been shown in the preceding Career.

The Table is a comprehensive exhibition of this Career, in accordance with its sketch given in the sacred text, (Rev. 8th & 9th,) in which only the long Periods are signified and marked, amounting to the whole time of the duration of the Career. The short Period of bondage, 3½ years, (comprehended in the composite Period of 150 years,) and the synchronal Periods of spiritual blindness, and captivity and restoration, all of an idolatrous and antichristian character, (having occurred after the Roman Church had become Antichrist and devoted to idolatry, as will be shown,) lead therefore only to the building up of an idolatrous and antichristian Church, and appear to be unnoticed in the prophetic account. Accordingly, they are about as unimportant in tracing the progress of the seed of Abraham as the history of a pagan people. Yet they lead to a re-invigoration of the Roman Church in the period of its conflict with the "four angels," suddenly risen to power, and will be briefly noticed at their date in the narrative, except the Period of blindness,—undiscovered.

In consequence of the change of the Roman empire from pagan to Christian by Constantine at the date of the change of the seat of government from Rome to Byzantium, (which he called Constantinople from

his own name,) the Church of Rome, to which he had given precedence and the strength of his royal power, became a State institution; and by reason of its descent from the Catholic Church and possession of its faith, the prophecy (Rev. 12,) was fulfilled in its birth and elevation to the throne, called "the throne of God," in like manner as David's throne was called "the throne of the Lord." Its founders contended earnestly against the power of paganism, and for the establishment of the Christian faith, and "overcame the dragon by the blood of the Lamb." It rose by the appointment of God to carry on the ways of his mysterious providence. Its distinguishing office appears to have been to execute retributive justice to the corrupt nations—"to rule all nations with a rod of iron."

Millennium.—The Millennial Period like its correspondent in the Ecclesiastical Career of Israel is composed of two divisions, 541 years and 459 years. In the first division the emperor or civil ruler of Rome was the king of the Church. In 871, the year of its termination, Pope Hadrian II. exercised the first act of sacerdotal sovereignty in commanding Hinkmar, the Bishop of Laon in France, to appear at Rome, and also the king, Charles the Bald, to send Hinkmar to him.* Though Charles at first resented the papal ordinance with marked indignation, he soon after maintained it in consideration of receiving the imperial crown from the pope. The crown which had before this been occasionally imposed by the bishop of Rome, as a ceremony, became from this time his *fief*. The emperor was the avowee or protector of the papacy and the pope the arbitrator of crowns and imperial pope. The bishop of Rome was now spiritual lord of the Roman Church and of kings.—Though he was four or five years in consummating the act of his assumption in 871, yet its date is the date of his rise to sovereignty. His temporal elevation, which is here found in combination with his ecclesiastical advancement, pertains to the Temporal Career.

In the last division of this Period the Roman Church descended into gross idolatry. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, "all worship of God was merged in the worship of saints, and the character of this was such as was to be expected from an uncultivated, immoral and superstitious age. The world was full of relics and miracles, the fruits of pious fraud and pious folly." In the thirteenth century, "the countless legions of the saints everywhere show the love of wonders, and the rude notions of morality which characterize the age. The heathen Saturnalia were annexed by the clergy to the festivals of the church, and a mockery of everything holy allowed under this screen." Auricular confession and the system of indulgences, kindred to them, were also introduced, "which the theologians of the thirteenth century did not scruple to justify on dogmatical grounds. Alexander Hales and Albert Mag-

* Neander's Hist. of the Church, vol. 3, pp. 364—366.

nus invented the doctrine of a THESAURUS SUPERERROGATIONIS PERFECTORUM, (treasure of superfluous good deeds of the *holy* [the dead who had been canonized,]) the *keys* of which were held by the pope. By this means they were enabled to blot out the sins not only of the *living* but of the *dead*, and even of those already in PURGATORY. This doctrine was more fully developed by Thomas Aquinas."*

The Pseudo-Isidorean notion of the Pope, as the universal bishop of the Church, was now carried to the extent before unthought of. The pope was now the vicar of Christ, and such was his supremacy over the laws, that he could give dispensation from their observance, "ante factum" (before the deed.) The doctrine of the infallibility of the pope (the reputed successor of St. Peter,) was now gradually brought forward. The popes laid claim also to new rights, the universal right of ABSOLUTION and DISPENSATION, the exclusive rights of CANONIZATION; and finally, in spite of all opposition, the right of exacting contributions from the churches.†

According to the characteristic of this Career, the operations announced by the first six trumpets, which comprise its Periods, appear to be of an ecclesiastical or spiritual character, the first four of which embraced within this Period, as they do not necessarily come within the plan of this Calendar, and as their figurative language seems to be such as may bear much speculation, will therefore be passed over here, except by offering a few suggestions upon the symbolic representations under the fourth trumpet, which appear to be an admirable picture of the antichristian and idolatrous dogmas of the Roman Church, stated in the preceding paragraphs,—by viewing the sun, moon, and stars as emblematical of *God, Christ the Mediator, and the ministers* of the several Churches within the Roman empire. By the raising of the pope to *infallibility and head* of the Church, Christ, one of the three persons of the triune God, *a third part of the sun, is smitten;* by the invention of the *treasure* of *superfluous* merits, Christ as our substitute, (one of the three offices of his mediatorship, substitute, priest and intercessor,) *a third part of the moon, is smitten*—by the idolatry and antichristian despotism of the Roman Church, its ministry, *a third part of the stars, is smitten* —the three parts of the stars being those of the Offspring Church, those of the seed of the woman prophesying in sackcloth, and those of the woman in the wilderness. And Christianity is darkened by the power of gross idolatry.

One thousand years having passed from the date of the dedication of Constantinople by Constantine, May 11th, 330, the imperial pope fell—"a star fell from heaven to the earth," Rev. 9: 1. In remark-

* Gieseler's Text Book of Eccl. Hist.
† Gieseler's Text Book, vol 2, pp. 340—.

able fulfillment, an epistle bearing the date of May 10th, 1330, (O.S.) was sent by the Franco-Italian pope John XXII. to Count Boniface for the arrest of the imperial pope, Nicholas V.,* called in Roman history an antipope, yet he was the legitimate incumbent, for he had been raised to the pontificate in accordance with the nomination of the emperor the avowee of the papacy, and John XXII. had been deposed by his order. The arrest was executed, and Nicholas was carried to Avignon with a rope around his neck and died in prison; soon after which the German princes at an electoral diet at Rense annulled the validity of the papal imposition of the crown, by an act which thenceforth became the law of the land. The bugbear which had existed in the infatuated world, that a crown without the confirmation of the pope was untenable, exploded, *and Peter's reputed successor, who had nearly reached the long contested pinnacle of superiority to the emperor, was now but a dependent of the French king.* Yet this was not the end of infatuation.

Bondage.—The bishop of Rome from this date, May 10th, 1330, though without crowns to bestow, was still pope, and retained the keys *given* to the papacy in the thirteenth century as before shown, enabling him to unlock the "*treasury of supererogation*," and thereby blot out the sins not only of the living, but the dead, even those in Purgatory.† "To him was given the key of the pit of the abyss," (Rev. 9: 1, literally rendered,) which appears to be the key of the *pit* of the *world of the departed*, or of things that *have been* and have *disappeared*. "And he opened the *pit* of the abyss,"‡ (v. 2,) the *great furnace* of punishment, *purgatory*, according to Roman theology, and by the smoke of the *pit*, (not the smoke of the abyss,) he terrified the world, which he enslaved in chains of oppressive spiritual bondage. By an adroit use of the revelations of this smoke, (the bugbears of the priest,) disclosing the history and state of the wicked dead, he carried on a system of horrors by the appliance of stringent penal statutes, punishments and penances, which, like the destructive locusts in the field, preyed upon the peace, happiness and estates of the deluded multitudes in that age of superstition.

The ordinances of the reputed vicar of the Lamb, clothed with the power of despotism by which they were enforced, seem to be fitly symbolized by the grotesque "*shapes*" or appearances of the locusts, (Rev. 9,) representing the strange combination of the *spirit* of the war horse, the *ruling* of man, the *gentleness* of woman, the *fierceness* of the lion and the evil *sequel* to the victims of such a system.

The historical records of that age abound in *kindred* terrors.

* Fleurii Hist. Ecc. John XXII., p. 380.

† See 24th page.

‡ The Greek phrase here rendered "pit of the abyss," is found only in these two verses in the Apocalypse. *Abyss* simply is the literal translation of the term rendered "bottomless pit" elsewhere in the English Bible. The king of the locusts was the "angel of the abyss,"—in accordance with the system of Romanism.

The trade of the priests in indulgences which was systemized in the beginning of this Period, is unequaled in enormity. "To regulate this traffic," says D'Aubigne, "they invented, probably in the pontificate of John XXII.,* the celebrated and scandalous tax for indulgences, of which more than forty editions are now extant; a mind of the least delicacy would be shocked at the repetition of the horrors therein contained.—Incest was to cost, if not detected, five groschen, if known or flagrant, six. A certain price was affixed to the crime of murder, another to infanticide, adultery, perjury, &c."†

The images of saints were everywhere, and relics, supposed to be animated with the spirit of the dead, found a lodgment in almost every dwelling and terrified its occupants. At the termination of 146½ years and a month from the epoch of this Period, the Roman Church appears to have reached its maximum point in saint-worship, and to have found relief by the elevation of the virgin Mary to an order of divinity. On the first of March, 1476, a constitution was published by pope Sixtus IV. to settle the long disputed question concerning the Virgin; in which he offered extraordinary indulgences to all who would celebrate the festival of the immaculate conception of the Virgin. This was immediately ratified with great rejoicing by an assemblage of the people on the appointed day, which was its first celebration by the Roman Church, according to Fleury.‡ This appears to have taken place on the 8th of December, as that is the date of the celebration of the immaculate conception according to the Calendar of the Roman Church. By this event their first Period of bondage in spiritual idolatry, 146½ years, was terminated; and they found in the Virgin an intercessor other than Christ, (whom they regarded as a *stern judge*, says Myconius, a writer of the Reformation,) and they glorified her as "*the real controller of all events—and the Ave Maria became the favorite prayer.*"§ Accordingly, the Roman Church is now fully gone over to idolatry, has blotted out Christianity, and appears to be fully Antichrist.

The remaining Period of spiritual bondage of like character which followed, 3½ years, by the power of the papacy, completes the whole time of the *power of the locusts*—"their power was to hurt men five months," (Rev. 9: 10,) which being thirty days to the month, and a day for a year, was 150 years, and terminated A. D. 1480.

Progress.—The power of the locusts to hurt men has terminated, not in the end of their power to hold men in spiritual darkness, but in the consummation of a system of idolatry, remaining unchanged (in which the Roman Church glories,) to the end of their Career. This Church

* Pope at the epoch of this Period.

† D'Aubigne, vol. 1, p. 38.

‡ Summo jubilo praeseus Sixti iv. Constitutio ab omnibus recepta fuit, estque de festo immaculatæ Conceptionis omnium prima quam ab Ecclesia Romana conditam fuisse novimus.—Fleurii His. Ec. Tom. 29, p. 557.

§ Gieseler vol. 3, p 315.

now (A. D. 1480,) comes into conflict with the "four angels* bound *at (epi)*† the great river Euphrates." This figurative expression of the locality of the "four angels," evidently signifies their Period in captivity (like that of the typical Period of the Jews in captivity at the Euphrates,) which will be considered in its proper place, in the second Career of the Christian Church. The "four angels," who now come into ecclesiastical hostility with the Roman Church, are "loosed," not *from* their captivity but *in* it, so that they carry on the cause of the gospel. Here there is an exposition of the synchronism of the Periods of captivity in the Christian era with the early part of the Periods of Progress. The Period of captivity, by reason of its becoming a period of ecclesiastical action by the loosing of the angels, *is therefore a component part of the progressive Period.* "The four angels," who then consisted of the *Hussite* and *Waldensian* Churches, (which became united in 1480,) and the Scriptures (which they translated and published early in this Period,)‡ were "*loosed*" in the year 1480 by a treaty of the humane Uladislaus, king of Bohemia, with the Utraquists.§ Consequently, the Hussite Church, (which had been banished by the papal party,) removed from their seclusion, (in the woods,) and settled in the towns of Bohemia and Moravia. Then commenced the Period of the progress of evangelical truth. In the year 1500 there were two hundred congregations of the Bohemian or Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia. In 1517 Luther appeared.

*Captivity and Renovation.*—The epoch of the Captivity of the Roman Church, (under the oppression of the pope, who in the time of this Career is the oppressor of his own flock as well as of the evangelical people,) occurred also in 1480. By uniting politics with their spiritual power in this Period, the popes raised armies, seized upon several principalities, made themselves kings of the states of the Church in Italy, and thereby founded a formidable power in the papacy. "Formerly," says Macchiavel, "no baron was so insignificant as not to despise the papal power; now a king of France stands in awe of him." The Babylonian character of the papacy was fully developed in this Period in that of the monsters who occupied the pontificate, under whom the spiritual bondage of their votaries like that of the preceding Period was continued. Following this the Roman Church became renovated by the formation and establishment of its Creed, known in general by the name of *Popery*, consisting of the profession of faith drawn up by the Council of Trent, which was assembled for the purpose of reform by Julius III.‖ A. D. 1550, and continued its sessions until 1563—together with the creed of Pius IV., containing a summary of the principal heads of the

* See 17th page.
† Literally rendered.
‡ In the year 1500 the Hussites had three printing presses in Bohemia and Moravia.
§ Gieseler Vol. 3, p. 371, note.
‖ Rees' Cyclopedia.

Roman religion. Of the pontificate of Pius V., the confirmer of this system, says Ranke, "the ordinances of the Council of Trent had everywhere gained a living power; all the bishops swore to the *Professio Fidei*, in which is embodied the substance of the dogmatic rules of the council, and pope Pius published the Roman catechism in which these are still more fully developed."* He died in 1572, just after the termination of 91 years from the epoch of the Period of captivity, and Popery, (an idolatrous temple,) has remained to this day as he left it.

The Church of Rome, (though much abridged in its magnitude by the "four angels,") was now comparatively restored by its renovation and the acquirement of temporal power by the papacy in Italy. Says Ranke, "with new and collected strength catholicism now advanced to the conflict with the protestant world. The pope was not only able to unite the strength of the other catholic powers for one common effort, but he had a territory of his own sufficiently powerful to contribute materially to its success."† From this time the Church of Rome makes advances, yet she loses ground—she increases in bulk, yet she loses power; and her Ecclesiastical organization, "*the third part of men*,"‡ must fall under the accumulating pressure of the four angels, "*who are prepared for an hour and a day and a month and a year*," which by computation (360 days for the year, 30 days for the month, and a day for a year,) is 391 years and 15 days, and terminates A. D. 1871, on about the 6th of June, if the date of the letter of John XXII., May 10th 1330,(old style,) for the arrest of Nicholas V., is the exact date of the fall of the imperial pope.

Note.—The action of the late council at Rome upon the subject of the immaculate Conception appears to have been, according to the report of the bishops, only a new explanation of a doctrine before received by the pious.

* Ranke's History of the Popes, Vol. 1, p. 226.
† Ranke's History of the Popes, Vol. 1, p. 231.
‡ Human society consists of three component societies, *the popular, the political and the ecclesiastical.*

| TABLE. | | | A. D. | Years |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Epoch. | Date of the second earthquake, (Rev. 8 : 5,) May 11th, - - - - - - - - | | 330 | |
| Bondage. | Period of the political bondage of Rome from the date of the second earthquake to the extinction of the western Roman empire, A.D. 476, - - - - | 146½ yrs. | | |
| | Period of oppression by a barbarian king, terminated A.D. 480, - - - | 3½ yrs. | | 150 |
| | Period of perplexity 40 years, undiscovered. | | | |
| Captivity. | Period of barbarian captivity from the end of the Periods of bondage, (A. D. 480,) terminated by the intervention of Justinian, A.D. 550, - - - - | 70 yrs. | | |
| Renovation. | Period of the construction and establishment of the Roman law, (the political temple) by Justinian, terminated A. D. 571, - - - - - - - - | 21 yrs. | | |
| | Sum, - - - | 91 yrs. | | |
| Progress. | Period Progressive, succeeding the Periods of bondage—terminated at the date of the assumption of sovereignty by Hadrian II., - - - | | 871 | 391 |
| Millennium. | Period from the date of the assumption of sovereignty by Hadrian II., to the dissolution of the Roman Church, - - - - - - | | 1871 | 1000 |

Bondage.—By the removal of the seat of government from Rome to Constantinople, Italy became a western province of the Byzantine dynasty, and the Church and people of Rome became politically the subjects of an eastern power. Constantine abolished the constitution of the Roman empire, vested all power in the imperial throne, and established a galling system of taxation. From the division by Theodosius the western provinces became the western Roman empire, and so continued under the yoke of some foreign prince or conqueror until its extinction, A. D. 476, by Odoacer who assumed the title of King of Italy, 146½ years from the removal of Constantine, constituting the first Period of bondage. The reign of Odoacer was cruelly oppressive and became but little relaxed during its earlier years, the first 3½ years of which appear to be

denoted as the short Period of bondage completing the specified time, 150 years—terminating A. D. 480.

Captivity.—The condition of Rome A. D. 480 remained unchanged, the termination of its Periods of bondage being the epoch of its Period of Captivity, which was of like character, in which it continued under the dominion of barbarian and Arian kings until its termination A. D. 550, when it was delivered from the captivity of the Gothic kingdom by Justinian, the Byzantine emperor, at the importunity of pope Vigilius and a patrician of Rome who had been sent to him by the people of Rome for aid, (A. D. 549,) and "*adjured him in the name of God and the people to resume the conquest and deliverance of Italy.*"*

Renovation.—In the subsequent Period of 21 years the Roman code of law, known as "*the Justinian Code,*" was constructed and established in Italy by its deliverer and his successor. At the termination of this Period, A. D. 571, the Lombards established their kingdom in Italy, and the emperor irretrievably lost his western provinces; but his world-renowned edifice stood unshaken by his defeat. The city of Rome remained under the government of his exarch for several years, and Roman jurisprudence became extended throughout Christendom and prevailed until the Reformation, about a thousand years.

Millennium.—First division, 459 years, from the date of the assumption of political sovereignty by Hadrian II. in commanding Hinkmar to Rome, to the date of the fall of the imperial pope, A. D. 1330.† In this division the bishop of Rome rose to the exalted power before alluded to of arbitrating crowns; and further than this, he aimed at absolute dominion in the affairs of both Church and State, and nearly attained to it before its termination. The second division, 541 years, now drawing near to its close, exhibits an immense loss to the Church of Rome, and indicates its temporal dissolution at the termination of the Period, A. D. 1871.

* Gibbon Vol. 4, p. 265.
† See Ecclesiastical Career.

# THIRD ADMINISTRATION.*

## CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

### SECOND CAREER.

| | TABLE. | Dates. | Periods. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A. D. | Years. | Years. |
| Epoch. | Date of the fall of the star, (Rev. 9 : 1,) May 10th | 1330 | | |
| Bondage. | Period of malignant hostility of "*the beast*" to the two witnesses after the end of their prophecy, (Rev. 11 : 7,)—from the date of the fall of the star to the consummation of Antichrist, | 1476 | 146½ | |
| | Period of the death of the two witnesses, "*three days and a half*," (Rev. 11 : 9,) terminated at their resurrection, | 1480 | 3½ | 150 |
| Darkness. | Period of twilight from the date of the perfection of Antichrist, (A.D. 1476,) to the appearance of Luther, | 1516 | 40 | |
| Captivity. | Period of the captivity of the two witnesses, (the four angels loosed, Rev. 9: 15,) from the date of their resurrection, (A. D. 1480,) to the epoch of reform by Edward VI. king of England, | 1550 | 70 | |
| Restoration. | Period of reform and establishment of the orthodox Creed terminated and confirmed by Elizabeth, | 1571 | 21 | |
| | Sum, | | 91 | |
| Progress. | Period of evangelical reformation from the resurrection of the two witnesses, A. D. 1480, (the epoch of the ecclesiastical action of the four angels, Rev. 9 : 15,) to the date of the dissolution of the Roman Church, and epoch of the reign of Christ, (Rev. 20 : 4,)—*an hour and a day and a month and a year*, (Rev. 9: 15,) terminated | 1871 | | 391 15 days |
| Millennium. | Period of the reign of Christ, (Rev. 20: 4,) terminated | 2871 | | 1000 |

The remnant of the seed of the woman, who have inculcated "*the testimony of Jesus Christ*" and withstood the power of the dragon throughout the Millennial Period of the first Career, now appear, (A. D. 1330,) with "*the seal of God*" upon their foreheads (Rev. 9 : 4,) designating their constancy, and open a *second* Career of the Christian Church.

* Order of the Periods according to the Formula on 13th page.

Bondage.—This Period, synchronized with the Period of "*five months*" (Rev. 9: 5,) appears to be signified by the hostility of the beast in the exposition, (Rev. 11: 7.) An immediate change in the condition of the remnant of the seed of the woman is not conspicuous in their history; but as the Period advances the enmity of the Roman Church becomes malignant and surfeited with rage. At the epoch of this Career they were in general known by the name of Lollards, a term of reproach. At a subsequent date, a branch of them who appeared in England were called Wickliffites, from the name of Wickliffe, who flourished before the middle of this Period, a bright luminary in the cause of the gospel, for their inculcation of which, and especially for their use of the translation of the Bible by him, they were violently persecuted by the Roman priesthood. His writings were transmitted to Bohemia through the instrumentality of queen Anne and a Bohemian nobleman which led to the conversion of John Huss, an eminent professor in the University of Prague. Through the power of his preaching, (for which he suffered martyrdom by the celebrated council of Constance,) great numbers adopted the faith of the gospel and formed a powerful party which contended for the use of the cup by the laity in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. A sanguinary war followed under the command of Ziska and Procopius on the part of the Hussites, which raged furiously for thirteen years. They effected several brilliant victories over the imperial forces, after which a treaty of peace was made granting them the use of the cup and its administration in their own language. By this event the Hussites became by the law of the land an *organized* Church. This state of things however was of short continuance. There were two parties of the Hussites—the Calixtines and the genuine followers of Huss. The true Hussites desired, besides the scriptural celebration of the sacrament, a real reformation of the Church. The Calixtines, who were satisfied with the liberty of the cup and the administration of the ordinance in their own language, and in other respects resembled the papists, were induced by their artifices to persecute the other party, "who, after a long series of military confusion," says Milner, "found themselves still a persecuted body of men, and those of them who had been inclined to have recourse to the sword, were gradually convinced that patient faith and perseverance in prayer are the proper arms of a christian soldier. Never indeed was there a more striking instance of the inefficiency of carnal weapons in defending the Church of Christ."* By the intrigues of the council of Basle, at a later day, they became much enfeebled. Says Milner again, "the persecutions now took a different turn; the Hussites were no longer tortured, but were driven out of the country; whence they were obliged to hide themselves in mountains and woods, and to live in the wilderness. In this situation

* Milner's Church History.

in the year 1467, they came to a resolution *to form a church among themselves and to appoint their own ministers.*"

This people remained several years in their seclusion from the world, where they were obliged to deny themselves the use of fires in the daytime lest their smoke should disclose their location. Yet they had spiritual life in the world so long as their *allies the Scriptures* held any vitality among men.

It has been shown in the Ecclesiastical Career of the Roman Church, that she became fully antichrist by her ratification "summo jubilo" (*with extreme rejoicing,*) of the constitution of Pope John XXII., at the festival of the conception, Dec. 8, 1476, whereby she adopted the virgin Mary as her intercessor, regarding Christ as a stern judge. By this act of the Roman Church, Christianity was blotted out. The witnesses were now slain. At this date they issued from their first Period of bondage at the termination of its time, 146½ years, and entered the bondage of "Sodom and Egypt" (Rev. 11: 8,) in a lifeless condition—they were dead—*the Hussite Church suppressed, and the Scriptures bereft of vitality;* yet not buried, not "*put in graves,*" for the Church, though ecclesiastically dead, required to be guarded in its seclusion to prevent *its action*—and the Scriptures, though deprived of public power, were yet preserved in the cloisters of the priesthood:—though their suppressors worshipped idols and not Christ, yet they retained his name—though they had become antichrist and martyred Christianity, yet they preserved *its carcase.* In the year 1480, the termination of the Period of 3½ years, the Bohemian Church in the wilderness "received a great increase of their numbers from the accession of Waldensian refugees, who escaped out of Austria, where Stephen, the last bishop of the Waldensees in that Province, was burnt alive"*—and relief came also by way of the treaty of Uladislaus before mentioned, with the Utraquists,† by which the Hussite Church was again recognized by the law of the land. Then appears to have been fulfilled the words of the text (Rev. 11: 11,) "*after three days and a half the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet.*"—Thus terminated the bondage of those who had the "*seal of God*" in their foreheads (Rev. 9: 5,) contemporaneous with the Ecclesiastical bondage of the Roman Church, "*five months,*" which being thirty days for a month, and a day for a year, is 150 years. In connection with these events, "the woman in the wilderness" (in whose communion were the Waldensian *refugees* above mentioned,) attained an *eminence,* which appears to be signified by her position on mount Zion," Rev. 14: 1.

Darkness.—The new Church soon after the favorable action of the king in 1480 came out of the wilderness and flourished for several years, yet by reason of persecution they dwindled in the latter part of this

* Milner's Church History.
† See page 27.

Period. Though they possessed and enjoyed the faith of the gospel, yet, amidst the gross darkness which surrounded them, their pilgrimage appears not to have been lightened by the meridian splendor of the sun of righteousness, and they remained obscure and exposed to the skill and persecution of their enemies for 40 years from the end of their first Period of bondage in 1476.

In the year 1516, Luther, the Joshua of the protestant Church, appeared and made known to the chapters in his circuit the doctrine of "*justification by faith.*" In 1517 he preached it at court and opened the effulgence of the gospel to the nations of Europe. In him is seen the joint leader of Israel and reformer of Christendom.

Captivity, Restoration, and Progress.—At the termination of the Period of Bondage (A. D. 1480,) the epoch of the Periods of captivity and progress, the "four angels" according to the Apocalypse appear to have been "loosed" *in* their captivity *at the great river Euphrates.* In a few years after the appearance of Luther, the Evangelical Church received the support of princes and numerous adherents. "There was a great earthquake"—*a shaking of the nations.* "The tenth part of the city fell"—perhaps Germany, one of the ten Kingdoms, (Rev. 17 : 12,) which fell from the support of Rome, A. D. 1552, before the army of Maurice of Saxony.

Henry VIII. became providentially instrumental of the introduction of protestantism into England. His hostility to the pope because he refused him a sentence of divorce from Catherine his queen, which prompted him to separate the English Church from Rome, and make himself its head, savored not of favor to the protestant religion, for he was hostile to Luther and the Reformation. By his course however he undermined the walls of Babylon, as did Cyrus his prototype, and led the way to the glorious events which followed his death. His people leaned strongly towards the new doctrines, and his youthful son and successor, Edward VI., through Warwick the protector, strenuously put into force the power of the crown, (like young Josiah his prototype in Israel,) *for the purging of England from Roman idolatry.* Luther died in 1546, Calvin the doctor of the Reformation had appeared and systematized its doctrines, Edward fully espoused its cause, and his council revised the English liturgy and embodied in it *the doctrines of faith* as professed by the reformers, which became legalized by an act of parliament in the year 1550, the date of the termination of the Captivity of the Evangelical Church, and the epoch of the rebuilding of *the temple of the Christian faith.* "Geneva," says Mosheim, "was acknowledged as a sister Church; and the theological system there established by Calvin was adopted and rendered the public rule of faith in England."

The power and influence of England rendered a greater degree of strength and safety to the protestants in other parts of Europe—kings raised the standard of the cross, and "the kingdoms of this world be-

came the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ,"—*prospectively* in part, exactly as the kingdoms of Canaan became the kingdoms of Israel by the promise of God when Israel entered upon the conquest of those nations.

In Calvin is seen the chief builder of the temple, the Zerubbabel of the modern Israel—"the theologian of the Reformation," says Melancthon—"the doctor of the Reformation," says D'Aubigne—"the most exalted character since the days of the apostles," says Scalinger. Yet his name is often traduced.

It is said that Calvin instigated the punishment of Servetus by death for heresy. But it appears from the notes in Murdock's Mosheim, that though he had caused his arrest for the alleged crime of heresy and blasphemy, yet that he and others of the clergy of Geneva conceded with the court not to punish him with death. The case seems to be that an old law of the empire existed for the punishment of heresy, that it was sanctioned by public opinion, (there having as yet been no issue between the Protestants and Romans upon that subject, except as to what constituted heresy,) and that the Presbyterian ministry of Geneva opposed the punishment of Servetus by death who had been arrested upon the complaint of Calvin. The court however would not yield. It appears also that Servetus had given Calvin cause of offense by opprobrious accusations against him as a minister of the gospel:—to what extent he may have been culpable in this respect depends upon the aggravation of the offence, which cannot perhaps be understood at this day. In view of the melancholy event, it should not be forgotten that Calvin's course was vindicated by the mildest men of that day—by Melancthon in particular, who wrote a letter to Geneva to express his approbation.* Nevertheless, far be it from the admirers of the great and the good to draw a veil over their errors. A true statement of the affair seems to be, that the conduct of Servetus was reprehensible, that Calvin made more account of it than was justifiable, and that the State alone was responsible for the fatal result. The refinement of the Church at a later age of its Period of progress ought not to be looked for in those turbulent times when it had just emerged from Rome.

Perhaps the most remarkable instance of obloquy in repute at this day, is the imputation to Calvin of the doctrine of the damnation of infants, as he appears to have been the first writer of celebrity in modern times in support of their salvation. In his article upon "Pedobaptism," in his "Institutes," he says respecting the passage in the 19th chapter of Matthew, "*of such is the kingdom of heaven,*" that the expression "*of such*" clearly shows *that infants themselves*, and those like them, are intended." Again, in his controversy with Servetus and the Anabaptists, in which he had adduced as an instance of regeneration in infancy the sanctification of John the Baptist, he says, "nor can they gain any ad-

* Murdock's Mosheim and Rees' Cyclopedia.

vantage by their frivolous evasion, that this was only a single case, which does not justify the conclusion *that the Lord generally acts in this manner with infants.*" Where he speaks of the salvation of "some" in another passage, he has reference to the additional testimony there is in favor of the salvation of the children of believers.

In closing this digression, to render a tribute of justice to the memory of him who has given shape to the Protestant Church in spiritual things, it seems proper to recognize his devotion to the cause of truth of his great qualifications, which appear in the surpassing force of his diction and acumen of thought, his accuracy and power of argument, and the profoundness of his erudition. "He was at twenty-two years of age," says Scaliger, "the greatest scholar in Europe." His voluminous writings, and the unequaled and almost incredible number of his valuable public and theological services, evince the untiring energies and exalted character of *the theologian of the Reformation.*

There was a unity of faith in the churches of the Reformation. Except in the matter of Christ's presence in the Lord's supper, the reformers concurred in the same fundamental doctrines, *the lost condition of man by the fall, and the way of salvation by the election, predestination and purpose of God and renewing of the Holy Spirit, through the atonement effected by the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus Christ.* These principles, as held by Calvin, were in like manner professed by Luther, as appears particularly in his answer to Erasmus entitled "DeServo Arbitrio;"—and were essentially supported by the Protestant Churches in general.

At the death of Edward VI. (A. D. 1553,) the enemies of the Church rose, as did the Samaritans of old, and made a strong effort to put a stop to its progress. Queen Mary, in a bloody reign, endeavored to restore the Roman religion in England, but failed. During the reign of Elizabeth, her successor, there was a combination of the Roman Catholic powers on the continent to carry out the scheme of the French and Spanish courts to overthrow the protestant religion. Says Hume, "no less than a total and universal extermination of the protestants by fire and sword was concocted by Philip and Catherine de Medicis."

Elizabeth, in view of the threatening array of hostility, put forth her strength and exercised a vigorous authority in both houses of parliament. In the year 1571 she caused the passage of a statute, that "whosoever by bulls should publish absolutions or other rescripts of the pope, or should by means of them reconcile any man to the Church of Rome, such offender, as well as those who were reconciled, should be guilty of treason. The penalty of a *premunire* was imposed on every one who imported any Agnus Dei, Crucifix or such other implement of superstition, consecrated by the pope."* At the same session of parliament, the termination of 21 years from the revisal of the liturgy by Edward VI.,

* Hume's History of England.

the liturgy was again revised, reduced to thirty-nine articles retaining *the Evangelical Faith*, and *ratified* by the Queen. Thus England was purged from the idolatry of Rome, and *the temple* of the Protestant Church "*opened*," (Rev. 11 : 19.)

England was now regarded by the emperor and pope as the citadel and bulwark of the protestant religion. Says Hume upon succeeding events, "Elizabeth was now sensible of the dangerous situation in which she now stood. In the massacre of Paris" (A. D. 1572,) "she saw the result of that general conspiracy" (above mentioned,) "for the extermination of the protestants; and she knew that she herself, as the *head and protectress of the new religion*, was exposed to the utmost fury and resentment of the Catholics."*

Ninety-one years of the Progressive Period, (the Periods of captivity and restoration,) have passed since the resurrection of the witnesses in the wilderness of Bohemia in 1480, leaving a balance of 300 years for the completion of their work preparatory to their regal state, the millennium of the Christian Church in this Career. In this short space of time they have made large conquests in Europe. The mightiest kings have been humbled, and many nations converted to Protestantism. The three Scandinavian kingdoms, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, and two British kingdoms, England and Scotland, (all outside the Roman empire, according to Macchiavel,) have become protestant. Within the empire, France wavers in convulsion, and Germany, a *tenth part* of the empire, has fallen.

In the plan of this Career in the Apocalypse as in that of the first, *two associated churches* come to view after the completion of the temple. The old church (Israel) first appears, having its numeral appellation of 144 thousand, (Rev. 14,)—(the scene having been changed and the Roman Church exhibited in the 12th and 13th chapters in the Apocalyptic drama.) This Church (the woman in the wilderness,) having passed through a Career and entered upon another in faithful devotion to God, bears upon the foreheads of its adherents the mark of long-tried fidelity and designation of its constancy. The Gentile Church (the second in order,) next appears, those who had "gotten the victory over the beast," (Rev. 15.) In this Career the offices of the two Churches are changed. The Period of bondage is accomplished, not by Israel as before, but by the Gentile Church, to whom the Careers pertain according to the exchange, (page 18th,) and the gospel is published to all the nations, and opposition to the gospel removed by virtue of the title of Israel to the world. As before stated, these two Churches and the scriptures appear to be the "four angels" whose Progressive Period is symbolically related in the 9th chapter—prepared for an hour and a day, and a month and a year, 391 years and 15 days. In the second prophecy, the particular

* Hume's History of England.

*events* of this Period during the synchronal Periods of captivity and restoration, which are found above, are sketched in the 11th chapter. An account of the particular *instrumentalities* in this Period is given in the 14th, 15th and 16th chapters.

Accordingly, the epoch of the operations of the two Churches detailed in the last mentioned three chapters is 1480, the date of the connection of the two Churches, of the position of the "woman in the wilderness" on "mount Zion," and the *loosing* of the "four angels," as appears from their history before cited, (page 33d.) The instrumentalities of the Church were feeble until the end of the Period of darkness, 40 years. There were no "sons of thunder" until the Lutheran reformation commenced in 1517. The work of reform being the work of Israel, all the reformers therefore, represented by the three angel preachers and two political powers, are found connected with and rising from her, in the 14th chapter, in which she appears under the appellation of "144 thousand," *her numeral name.* As there have not been three descriptions of preachers, each separately engaged in but one of the offices of the first three angels, it appears that they denote three general characteristics of the preaching of this Period. These characteristics are of a *spiritual and political* character—comprising the inculcation of the gospel, the denunciation of Babylon and the condemnation of the adherents of the "beast" in the presence of the holy angels and the Lamb. To the first, the early reformers directed their efforts with great zeal. Luther gave the Bible to the people of Germany in their own language and trumpeted gospel truth upon the four winds. Calvin engaged in this enterprise upon a large scale. He advocated an ecclesiastical system which allows no rank or ecclesiastical power in the ministry, and was instrumental in the establishment of an institute in Geneva, having for its purpose the universal dissemination of Christian knowledge according to the faith and practice of the Presbyterian Church. "The views and projects of this great man," says Mosheim, "were grand and extensive. He laid a scheme of sending forth from this little republic the succors and ministers that were to promote and propagate the protestant cause through the most distant nations." In the 17th and 18th centuries some advance was made in extending the circulation of the scriptures. In the 19th century a great work has been done, and most of the nations and tribes of the earth may now read the bible in their own language. The fulfillment of the offices of the last two angel preachers by the evangelical ministry in this Period is well known and therefore requires no remarks. The great prince, known by the appellation of "*the head of the Church*," and recognized by Christendom as the chief supporter of the Protestant religion, who has extended the power of the British throne to all quarters, from the reign of Elizabeth to this day, in support of the doctrines of the Reformation, appears to be designated by the regal re-

former (Rev. 14: 14.) The other angel having a sickle may be found perhaps in German history—time will show. The end of his commission appears to be the subversion of the papal states in Italy, which cover a space of 1600 furlongs, at the termination of this Period A. D. 1871.

The appearance of the seceding Gentile Church, "those who had gotten the victory over the beast" (Rev. 15,) at the date of their deliverance from bondage (A. D. 1480,) is indicated by their singing the song of Moses,—signifying by the type the termination of a Period of bondage. "The temple of the tabernacle of the testimony" is perhaps typified by the tabernacle of the Lord, which the children of Israel erected soon after their exit from bondage. The seven plagues, which follow, come not necessarily within the plan of this work, seem to require much historical as well as scriptural qualification to solve them, and will therefore be passed over here with the single remark, that they clearly come within the operations of the "four angels" in the 9th chapter, "prepared for an hour and a day, and a month and a year"—terminating according to previous computation in 1871.

Millennium.—Accordingly, the Ecclesiastical Millennium of the Protestant Church, *the reign of Christ a thousand years* (Rev. 20: 4,) will terminate in the year of our Lord 2871.

# PURITAN CHURCH.

## ECCLESIASTICAL CAREER.

GENEALOGY AND MISSION.—*The remnant of the seed of the woman,* which has been treated of in preceding Careers as a Church, though not in form as such until the fourteenth century, and which appears under the appellation of *those men who had the seal of God in their foreheads* (Rev. 9 : 4,) at the opening of the second Career of the Christian Church, must be regarded according to the developments as a new Church at that date. Before this they acted as a *delegated body.* From this epoch, though still pursuing the cause of the two witnesses, yet they appear as an *independent body* in the prosecution of their own Career, and entitled, from their primitive character, to an Offspring invested with ecclesiastical and political properties at the termination of 300 years from the date of their epoch as a new Church, May 10, 1330, (O. S.)

On the 12th of June, 1630, (N. S.) (less than a month from the expiration of the Period denoting the rise of the Offspring Church,) the Massachusetts Colony, called "*the Governor and Company of Massachusetts' Bay,*" arrived at Salem with a Colonial charter from the king of England. "Before this company sailed from England, April 1630," says Bradford, "they addressed a letter signed by Winthrop [their governor,] Saltonstall, Johnson, Dudley, Phillips, Coddington, and others, to their brethren of the Episcopal Church, in which they acknowledge the church of England as their mother, blessing God for their birth and education as Englishmen, expressing christian charity for all the pious and good of that community, and desiring their prayers for the success of the enterprise in which they had engaged."* The Massachusetts' Colony is therefore identified as the Offspring Church of 1630, the protestant Church, from which it is lineally descended, having been found to be a continuation of "*those who had the seal of God in their foreheads,*" (or of the "woman clothed with the sun.") This Church then is the nucleus of the American Church, designated (according to the established course of things,) to accomplish the associated Ecclesiastical and Temporal Careers of this Administration, and eventually to give external form to the Protestant Church at large, of which it is a part. Though it is at this time ecclesiastically distinct, yet, spiritually, it is connected with all other churches of the same faith—holding to the same fundamental principles of salvation:—and with such it co-operates in prosecuting the enterprises of this Career, most of which have not become history.

MILLENNIUM.—The "King" and "Bishop" of this Church, to whom alone they acknowledge spiritual allegiance, is "the Lord of heaven."

* Bradford's History of Massachusetts.

At an expense of the sacrifice of much worldly interest they emigrated to the American wilderness to enjoy liberty in the worship of God. In this " place of refuge" they providently guarded their seclusion from the world by legal enactments, excluding innovators from sects whose history in Europe exhibited them as disturbers of the peace of Christian society, and on account of whom they had left the old world, braved sea and climate, and lost by death hundreds of their numbers. Yet, strange to say, they soon found that fines, imprisonments, banishment and even death, were not preventives of intrusion.

" Their treatment of Anne Hutchinson was, indeed, unjustifiable.— The severity of their magistracy to the Quakers (who franticly sought for death,) was soon stayed by the opposing voice of the people, who did not relish sanguinary proceedings against unequal offenses.

Their extensive moral and religious enterprises have pervaded the nation, made the world better, and laid a foundation upon which they may contribute greatly towards the elevation and spiritual good of man in subsequent time. Their rapid progress during the first *fourth* of this Period foreshadows the typical developments of their future glory.

| | TABULAR VIEW OF THE EARLY PERIODS. | Dates. | Periods. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A.D. | Yrs. | Yrs. |
| Epoch. | Date of the arrival of the Massachusetts' Colony at Salem, June - - - - - | 1630 | | |
| Bondage. | Period of bondage to the crown of England from the date of the arrival at Salem to the date of the battle at Trenton—resulting in the defeat of the British army by General Washington, and their retreat into winter quarters, December, - - - - - | 1776 | 146½ | |
| | Period of military oppression, terminated at the date of the acquisition of essential aid from France, consisting of a naval fleet bearing six thousand troops and large supplies under the command of Rochambeau, July, - - - - - - - - - | 1780 | 3½ | 150 |
| Perplexity. | Period of national trials and perplexities from the date of the battle of Trenton, December, 1776, to the date of the assembling of Congress in the last year of the administration of President Madison, December, | 1816 | 40 | |
| Captivity. | Period of political *inferiority to the slave States* from the date of the adoption of the State Constitution of Massachusetts (June 1780,) to the date of the advocacy of the admission of California, as a free State, by President Taylor and both houses of Congress, in the summer of the year - - - - | 1850 | 70 | |
| Reform. | Period of political reform from the date of the *ascendant of Americanism* (1850,) to the completion of the temple of Liberty, - | 1871 | 21 | 91 |

The Reformation in Europe by the Christian Church being only of an *ecclesiastical* character, the forms of civil government, though modified by the influence of Christianity, have remained as they were. Hence, by the union of State with the Church, which has to a great extent prevailed and embarrassed it, the intolerance (of the State—rather than the Church,) in the seventeenth century occasioned the emigration of the Puritans to America.

To this Offspring Church pertains the office of effecting the political reformation of the world.

BONDAGE.—Early in this Period the Massachusetts' Colony became strengthened by confederation.

"No restriction was placed upon them except that contained in the Charter, that no laws should be made repugnant to the laws of England ;

and this was construed very liberally, to mean that no part of the English law was in force there till it was expressly re-enacted. At first the magistrates governed without any rule than their own sense of right and their interpretation of the law of God. But the people becoming jealous of so large a discretion, a code, or 'Body of Liberties,' was established, consisting of one hundred articles, drawn up with singular brevity and clearness, embracing many of the best and most liberal provisions of the English Common Law, and, in some respects, in advance both of English and American law at the present day. This code became the basis of legislation, not only in Massachusetts, but throughout New England, the other colonies adopting many of its most important provisions."*

From the first, the sentiments of this people strongly inclined to Republicanism. By confederations and alliances they extended their influence and became a leading power, especially in New England. Throughout the colonies the spirit of liberty seems to have had a spontaneous growth. Ultimately the measures of the British ministry became intolerable, the Declaration of Independence by the thirteen United States followed, and the battle at Trenton in December, 1776, marks the separation of the colonies from England by the decisive victory of the American arms, the termination of the first Period of bondage, 146½ years.—Another victory by Washington immediately followed, at Princeton, at the close of which (early in January,) both armies retired to winter quarters. In just 3½ years from this date, (July 10, 1780,) the French fleet under the command of Rochambeau arrived, from the accession of which, their Period of oppression, *by a superior power*, was terminated.

Note.—New England, now populated by the segregation of Puritans (from whom proceeds this Career,) is involved by alliance with the Confederated American States, and her Careers are now emphatically American. The Declaration of Independence, which issued from the first period of bondage, is the ruling director in this Career, like Moses, or Christ, or the "two prophets," in their Careers, at the terminations of the corresponding Periods of which they appeared.

Perplexity.—To the national trials characterizing this Period, consisting in general of political strife in settling the character and measures of the government, frequent wars with the Indian tribes, trouble with France, war with Algiers, war with Tripoli, and a second fratricidal war with England;—to these there came a general termination at the close of this Period, occasioning the following noticeable allusion in the message of President Madison to Congress in the month of December 1816:—

"I can indulge the proud reflection that the American people have reached in safety and success, their fortieth year as an independent nation; that for nearly an entire generation they have had experience

* Weber's Outlines of Universal History.

of their present constitution, * * * that they have found it to bear the trials of adverse as well as prosperous circumstances."

In contrast to this Period, general peace and great prosperity have followed.

CAPTIVITY.—Upon the foundation of the AMERICAN DOCTRINE of the social rights of man, that "*all men are born free and equal*," the State of Massachusetts formed their Constitution, which was adopted by the people in convention, in the month of June, 1780—the date of which is the epoch of the Period of the captivity of the American States. In the Revolution an anti-American element remained, in the investment of an oligarchy with the despotic power of the institution of slavery, who, from their advantage in the Confederacy, held a check upon the progress of liberty, and a superiority in the national councils prejudicial to the interests of the States, until its indicated termination at the end of seventy years, A. D. 1850,—when Americanism appeared in the ascendant—(as stated in the Table.)

This Period, as well as the former, is a Period of exile from the old world. Though the American colonies released themselves from bondage, they still remained restricted to the country of their refuge. They could set up their standard only there.

REFORM AND RESTORATION.—At the epoch of this Period (A.D. 1850,) in accordance with the established course of things, the work of reform and construction of the temple commenced. In the admission of California as a free State by Congress, the free States have a numerical superiority, and the temple of Liberty, consisting of principles harmonizing with the spirit of the declaration of '76, begins to rise. According to the typical demonstration the work will be prosecuted and finished by successors of its founders, the President and Congress of the United States, who represent the sovereignty of the American people. In accordance with the typical demonstration it is now encountering the opposition of the Samaritans. It is to be hoped that the present federal administration, whose time coincides exactly with that of the reign of the bloody Queen Mary* (from '53 to '57,) in the Period of the construction of the temple of the Protestant faith, will be less sanguinary. The Samaritans and Mary gained nothing but a delay of the work for a short season. The work of God is sure. The several corresponding examples on preceding pages clearly testify *the completion* of the temple, and *the purging* of the country from the element so incongruous with the American declaration of human rights, at the termination of this Period of 21 years, A. D., 1871.

In 1850, the United States burst her ancient restrictions and returned whence they came—not by a return of the population, as did the Jews, when restored from Babylon to their Canaan—the world is the Canaan

* See page 36th.

of this people; but by the introduction of their power and American principles into the dominions of the old dynasties. Her exclusion of the British dominion from Central America by the Clayton and Bulwer treaty, her action with Austria according to her principles announced in Webster's Hulseman letter, her example of sympathy for the oppressed in the relief of the Hungarian exiles by a naval force, and the refusal of Mr. Cass at Rome to kneel to the pope, on the occasion of a complimentary visit of the ambassadors, exhibit a formidable debut in the year 1850—and an initiatory of the line of her march during her Period of progress. Here the Offspring Church appears in the sacred text (being the next in order according to the arrangement of the Apocalypse,) the angel who came down from heaven,* *having great power;* and (in the train of his progress, just entered,) "*the earth* [the political world] *was lightened* with his glory." (Rev. 18: 1.)

From a retrospective view of the past, from the typical indications and the developments of the 18th and 19th chapters of the book of St. John's Revelation, the prospective vision of the remainder of this Period of reform and restoration is indeed awfully sublime and terrific The triumphs of truth are at hand, and error must yield to the reign of the principles of the crucified Savior.

---

The latter part of this Career, which runs 300 years later than that of the Christian Church, appears to be signified by the "*little season*" (Rev. 20: 3,) when the policy of the dragon will again appear in the governments of "the nations," (as formerly at Rome,) and great numbers will fall from the support of the truth. The battle of Gog and Magog, terminated by the intervention of the Lord, closes. The symbols and general figurative language in the description of the "New Jerusalem" appear to be significant of the state of the Church beyond the bounds of time.

* Strictly speaking, not the United States *in persona*, but her *minister* abroad. Mark here, that America is introduced in the Apocalypse, not in the days of her youth, as was the Protestant Church, before she "rose to heaven" (Rev. 11: 12,)—nor in her infancy, as was the Roman Church (Rev. 12,)—but in the age of her manhood.

# APPENDIX.

## THE WOMAN IN THE WILDERNESS.

At the date of the epoch of the state Church in the Christian Roman empire, (A. D. 330,) there was a large body of evangelical dissenters, comprising several sects. Though numerous, they were overborne by the power of the state and ECCLESIASTICALLY DISFRANCHISED. They soon became obscure, and were treated at a later day as outcasts from society. Though followed by persecution and the endeavors of Rome from age to age to crush them, a line of them continued until relief came through the preponderating influence of the Protestant powers in the seventeenth century. These dissenters appear to have been the succession of the apostolic Church, rendered memorable by the appellation of the "*woman clothed with the Sun*" (Rev. 12: 1.) Their appellations of Catharists or Puritans, and heretics, by the Roman writers, who have thus characterized them, even before the reign of Constantine, and throughout the middle ages, are testimonies of a coeval dissenting succession.

In the year 251 Novatian was ordained the pastor of a Church in the city of Rome, which maintained no fellowship with the metropolitan Church, whose writers say that he was the first antipope and the author of the heresy of Puritanism. These writers complain loudly of the schism that was made by the Novatians, whose difference from the other Church consisted only in matters of form and discipline. This sect extended into Africa and Asia Minor.*

"Constantine's first letters [to the dissenters] were mild and gentle. But he was soon persuaded into more violent measures; for out of his great zeal to extinguish heresy, he issued edicts against all such as his favorite bishops persuaded him were the authors and abettors of it, and particularly against the Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionists and others, whom, after reproaching with being enemies of truth, destructive counsellors, &c., he deprives of the liberty of meeting for worship, either in public or private places, and gives all their oratories to the orthodox Church."†

These people yet had much success, notwithstanding the power exercised against them. Says Mr. Robinson concerning Novatian, "great numbers followed his example, and all over the empire Puritan churches were constituted, and flourished through the succeeding two hundred years. Afterwards, when penal laws obliged them to lurk in corners,

* Wm. Jones' His. Ch. Church, p. 142, 143.
† Jones' Hist. Ch. Church, p. 137.

and worship God in private, they were distinguished by a variety of names, and *a succession of them continued until the Reformation.*"* Says Dr. Lardner, "the vast extent of this sect is manifest from the names of the authors who have mentioned them, or written against them, and from the several parts of the Roman empire in which they were found."†

There was also in Africa a sect of evangelical dissenters, the Donatists, whose epoch was about half a century later than the Novatians, with whom and the State Church they agreed in the doctrines of faith. Says Mr. Jones in his account of them from the writings of Dr. Lardner, "the Donatists were very numerous, for we learn that in the year 411, there was a famous conference held at Carthage, between the Catholics and the Donatists, at which were present 286 Catholic bishops, and of the Donatists 279; which, when we consider the superior strictness of their discipline, must give us a favorable opinion of their numbers, and especially as they were frequently the subjects of severe and sanguinary persecutions from the dominant party."

There was also in the east a sect of evangelical dissenters called Paulicians, who rose about the year 660, of whom Constantine, who took the name of Sylvanus, appears to have been the founder. He was stoned to death by the order of a Greek officer. This people seem to have been almost incessantly subjected to persecution for a period of 150 years. "In this, as well as in former instances, the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church. A succession of teachers and churches arose: and a person named Sergius, who had labored among them in the ministry of the gospel thirty-seven years, is acknowledged, even by their vilest calumniators, to have been a most exemplary Christian. The persecution had, however, some intermissions, until at length Theodora, the Greek empress, exerted herself against them beyond all her predecessors. She sent inquisitors throughout all Asia Minor in search of these sectaries, and is computed to have killed by the gibbet, by fire, and by the sword, *a hundred thousand persons.* Such was the state of things at the commencement of the ninth century."‡

"In the year 590 the bishops of Italy and of the Grisons, to the number of nine, rejected the communion of the pope, as of an heretic. This schism had already continued from the year 553, and lasted near as long after; so little were they persuaded at that time of the popes' infallibility that to lose communion with them was to lose the communion of the Church, or that they held their ordinations from the hand of the popes, and to the bishops subjected to their jurisdiction."§

It appears then that at the epoch of the Roman Church, other sects existed, composing a numerous body of evangelical christians, who re-

* Robinson's Ec. Researches, p. 126.
† Lardner's Works, 4 to Ed. Vol. 2, *p.* 57.
‡ Jones' Church History, p. 187.
§ Dr. Allix on An. Chs. of Piedmont, p. 35

jected their communion, that they flourished for several centuries, and became enlarged by accessions from the dominant Church. That these people were "the woman in the wilderness," appears evident from their character and condition, and from their later history.

In the ninth century there was a large accession to the dissenters in the valleys of Piedmont and the neighboring country of the Milanese by the preaching of Claude, who was promoted to the see of Turin in 817.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries their churches became so numerous in the last mentioned localities that the State Church became alarmed, and exercised a mighty military power to extirpate them, by which great multitudes were destroyed, and the dissenting Church at length disappeared in that quarter. Says Weber, "Provence and Languedoc in the South of France, where, under a beautiful and serene sky, a prosperous race of burghers had developed their free institutions, where the cheerful Provencal poetry of the Troubadours had indulged its petulant and satirical humor at the expense of priests and bishops, was the residence of these Albigenses (so called from the city of Alby.) Against these men and their protector, Raimond VI. of Toulouse, Innocent III. ordered the cross to be preached by the Cistercian monks.—Hereupon, bands of savage warriors, with some fanatical monks, bearing the cross before them, marched into the blooming land, destroyed the rich cities, towns and villages, slaughtered the innocent with the guilty, lighted up the flames of death, and filled the whole country with murder, plunder and desolation. Raimond for a long time resisted his enemies; but when Louis VIII., excited by an ignoble cupidity for extending his possessions, undertook the war against the heretics, the count submitted, and concluded a peace by which he surrendered the greater part of his territories to France. But a desolatory war of twenty years had destroyed the beautiful culture of the south of France, turned the land into a wilderness, and silenced forever the cheerful song of the Troubadour. A few years afterwards, the gallant peasant republic of the Stedingers was visited in a similar manner by a war of extermination, at the instance of the bishops of Bremen and Ratzburg."*

The following sketches from the "Introduction of Dr. Edgar's "Variations of Popery" present a comprehensive view of the dissenters under their modern appellation of Waldensians.

"The antiquity of the Waldensians is admitted by their enemies, and is beyond all question. Waldensianism, says Rainerus the Dominican, is the ancientest heresy; and existed, according to some, from the time of Sylvester, [pope in the reign of Constantine,] and according to others, from the days of the apostles.† This is the reluctant testimony of an

* Weber's Outlines of Universal History, p. 148.

† Aliqui enim dicunt, quod duravit a tempore Sylvestri; aliqui a tempore Apostolorum. Rainerus, 3, 4.

Inquisitor in the thirteenth century. He grants that Waldensianism preceded every other heresy.

"The Waldensians, says Rainerus, Seysel and Alexander, dated their own origin and the defection of the Romish communion from the Papacy of Sylvester.* Leo, who flourished in the reign of Constantine, they regard as their founder. Romanism at this period ceased to be Christianity, and the inhabitants of the valleys left the unholy communion.—These simple shepherds lived, for a long series of years, in the sequestered recesses of the Alpine retreats, opposed to popish superstition and error.

"The Waldensians, as they were ancient, were also numerous. Vignier, from other historians, gives a high idea of their populousness. The Waldensians, says this author, multiplied wonderfully in France, Italy, and especially in Lombardy, notwithstanding the Papal exertions for their extirpation.

"This sect, says Nangis, were infinite in number; appeared, says Rainerus, in nearly every country; multiplied, says Sanderus, through all lands; infected, says Caesarius, a thousand cities, and spread their contagion, says Ciaconius, through almost the whole Latin world.† Scarcely any region, says Gretzer, remained free and untainted from this pestilence. The Waldensians, says Popliner, spread, not only through France, but also through nearly all the European coasts, and appeared in Gaul, Spain, England, Scotland, Italy, Germany, Bohemia, Saxony, Poland, and Lithuania.‡

"The diocese of Papan, it was computed, contained forty Waldensian schools, and eighty thousand Waldensian population. The Albigensian errors, according to Daniel, infected all Languedoc, and corrupted the nobility and the populace. The Romish temples, according to Bernard, were left without people, the people without pastors, and the pastors without respect.

"Waldensianism was, in anticipation, a system of the purest Protestantism, many ages before the Reformation. This, in its fullest sense, has, with the utmost candor, been acknowledged by many cotemporary and succeeding historians, who were attached to Romanism. The Waldensians, says Gratias, 'differed little from the Reformed in anything.' 'The Henricians and Waldensians,' says Mezeray, 'held nearly the same dogmas as the Calvinists.' Moreri, Tillet, Serrus, Evenswyn, and Marca, grant the 'agreement of the Waldensian faith in all the principal articles with the Reformed theology.'

* Romana ecclesia non est ecclesia Jesu Christi, sed ecclesia malignantium, eamque sub Sylvestro deficisse.—Alex. 17. 368. Seysel 9.

† Fere enim nulla est terra, in qua hæc secta non sit. Rain. c. 4. Infecerunt usque ad mille civitates. Cæsar, V. 21.

‡ Non per Galliam solum totam, sed etiam per omnes pene Europæ oras. Poplin. 1, 7.

"The sanctity of the Waldensian morality corresponded with the purity of the Waldensian faith. The piety, benevolence, innocence, and holiness of this people have challenged the esteem and extorted the approbation of friend and foe.

"Rainerus, quoted by Alexander, admits 'their show of piety and integrity before men.' This is pretty well for a Dominican Inquisitor, who discovered, however, that Waldensian piety was mere dissimulation. But Rainerus also acknowledges 'their sobriety, modesty, chastity, and temperance, with their aversion to taverns, balls, vanity, anger, scurrility, detraction, levity, swearing and falsehood. He grants their attention, men and women, young and old, night and day, to learning or teaching; and he had seen a Waldensian rustic, who repeated Job, word for word, and many who perfectly knew the whole of the New Testament.'

"Seysel acknowledged 'their purity of life, which excelled that of other Christians.' Lewis, the French King, asserted 'their superiority, both to himself and to his other subjects, who were professors of Catholicism.'* Alexander vindicates the Waldensians from the calumny of Ebrard and Emeric, who had accused them of avarice, lewdness and unchastity. Thuanus records their detestation of perjury, imprecations, scurrility, litigation, sedition, gluttony, drunkenness, whoredom, divination, sacrilege, theft, and usury. He mentions their chastity, which they accounted a particular honor, their cultivation of manners, their knowledge of letters, their expertness in writing, and their skill in French.

"The Waldensians, notwithstanding the sanguinary persecutions of Romanism, still exist, and still are persecuted in their native valleys. A population of twenty thousand always remain, and exhibit, to an admiring world, all the grandeur of truth and all the beauty of holiness. Their relics still show what they have been, and they continue unaltered amid the revolution of ages. The world has changed around this sacred society; while its principles and practice through all the vicissitudes of time, live immutably the same. The Waldensian Church, though despised by the Roman hierarchy, illuminated, in this manner, the dark ages; and appears, in a more enlightened period, the clearest drop in the ocean of truth, and shines the brightest constellation in the firmament of holiness; sparkles the richest gem in the diadem of Immanuel, and blooms the fairest flower in the garden of God."†

Before the termination of the first Period of the "Woman in the Wilderness," A. D. 1590, (1260 years from 330,) most of these people had been either merged with the Calvinistic Churches of France and

* Puriorem quam cæteri Christiani vitam agunt. Seysel, 92. Me et cætero populo meo Catholico, meliores illi viri sunt. Camer. 419.

† Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 53–58.

Geneva, or exterminated by the power of Rome.* The larger part of the remainder at this date had their residence in the valleys of Piedmont and Saluces, under the government of the Duke of Savoy. The defeat of the combined forces of the Roman Catholic powers for the extermination of the Protestants, by the destruction of the "Invincible Armada" of Spain fitted out against England in 1588, and the success of Henry IV. in France in 1590, which gave the adherents of the evangelical faith an ascendency of power in Europe—together with the consideration of the loyalty of the Waldenses and the toleration of their religion by the Duke of Savoy—appear to be the events marking their first exit from the wilderness in 1590, which, like their first flight into the wilderness, was not complete.

Their history in 1655, exhibits a wonderful termination of the second Period, computed from 395, (when the woman fled upon *the wings of an eagle,*) in which it seems not easy to determine which was most conspicuous, the rage of the adversary, or the humanity and zeal of the friends of truth. The valleys of Piedmont then contained the "woman in the

---

* FOUNTAIN OF PERSECUTION.

PAPAL BULL AGAINST THE WALDENSES.

The persecuting character of the Popes is well exemplified in the bull of INNOCENT VIII., investing Albert de Capitaneis, arch-DEACON of Cremona, with power to act as his legate and commissioner—in which after a preamble and some prefatory remarks he thus proceeds:—

"We have heard, and it is come to our knowledge not without much displeasure, that certain sons of iniquity, followers of that abominable and pernicious sect of men called the Poor of Lyons, or Waldenses, who have long ago endeavored, in Piedmont and other places, to ensnare the sheep belonging to God, to the perdition of their souls, having damnably risen up under a feigned pretence of holiness, being given up to a reprobate sense, and made to err greatly from the way of truth, committing things contrary to the orthodox faith, offensive to the eyes of Divine Majesty, and which occasions a great hazard of souls, * * * We, therefore, having determined to use all our endeavors, and to employ all our care, as we are bound by the duty of our pastoral charge, to root up and extirpate such a detestable sect, that the hearts of believers may not be damnably perverted from the Catholic church, have thought good to constitute you, at this time, for the cause of God and the faith, the Nuncio Commissioner of us and of the apostolic see within the dominions of our beloved son Charles, Duke of Savoy, to the end that you should induce the followers of the most wicked sect of the Waldenses, and all others polluted with heretical pravity, to abjure their errors, &c.; and, calling to your assistance all archbishops and bishops seated in the said duchy, whom the Most High hath called to share with us in our cares, with the inquisitor, the ordinaries of the place, their vicars, &c., you proceed to the execution thereof against the aforenamed Waldenses, and all other heretics whatever, *to rise up in arms* against them, and, by a joint communication of processes, to tread them under foot as *venomous adders,* (diligently providing that the people committed to their charge do persevere in the profession of the true faith,) bending all your endeavors, and bestowing all your care, towards so holy and so necessary an *extermination* of the same heretics. * * * Thou, therefore, beloved son, taking upon thee with a devout mind the burden of so meritorious a work, show thyself in the execution thereof so careful in word and deed, and so diligent and studious, that the much-wished-for fruits may, through the grace of God, redound unto thee from thy labors, and that thou mayest not only obtain the crown of glory which is bestowed as a reward on those that prosecute pious causes, but that thou mayest also ensure the approbation of us and of the apostolic see.—Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the 27th April, 1487, and in the third year of our popedom."

wilderness"—Saluces having been depopulated in 1601, by the duke, at the urgency of the pope, Clement VIII.;—otherwheres there were but few of this people. The dispersed evangelical Churches in Bohemia and Poland do not appear to be of this line, as they were remains of the Hussite Church.

In the month of January, 1655, an order was given by the duke of Savoy for the extermination of the Waldenses of Piedmont, upon which they dispatched messengers to their friends in the Swiss cantons. All the Protestant powers of Europe were forthwith aroused, and several embassadors were immediately sent to France and Savoy in their behalf, among whom was Sir Samuel Morland, from the British government, with a contribution of thirty-eight thousand pounds for the benefit of the Waldensian Churches—of whom more than six thousand they found had been massacred before their arrival. Through the intervention of these powers the residue were saved and a treaty was negotiated, conceding them perpetual rights as a church and as a community, for the fulfillment of which the court of France was pledged by their embassador, who was also there. They afterwards, however, suffered a cruel persecution by France and Savoy, who broke their faith, (in accordance with the doctrine of the Roman Church, that they are not bound to keep their faith with heretics,) and were banished by them from Piedmont, at the time of the atrocious persecution and banishment of the Calvinists of France, by Louis XIV.;* yet, from the date of the treaty in 1655, (though a hard one, as it proved,) they were a people ECCLESIASTICALLY ENFRANCHISED† *by the great powers of the earth.*

* Jones' Church History.
† See page 46th.

# SLAVERY AND THE CHURCH.

---

TWO LETTERS

## ADDRESSED TO REV. N. L. RICE, D. D.,

IN REPLY TO HIS LETTERS TO THE CONGREGATIONAL DEPUTATION, ON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY.

ALSO A

## LETTER TO REV. NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D.,

IN ANSWER TO THE "SOUTH SIDE VIEW OF SLAVERY."

BY

SMECTYMNUUS.

---

BOSTON:
CROCKER AND BREWSTER.
1856.

# PREFACE.

At the last meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, (Old School,) several Congregational Associations were represented by their delegates. Under instructions from these bodies, they introduced the subject of Slavery, and expressed their fears that this branch of the church was remiss in her duty in this matter; and in the way of friendly remonstrance, they presented the views of the Congregational churches, as opposed to the silence and inaction of the General Assembly. Rev. Dr. Rice, of St. Louis, was Moderator of the Assembly. The delegates were kindly received, but this part of their mission found little favor with the Southern churches. Dr. Rice subsequently addressed ten Letters to the deputation on the subject of slavery, in which there is an odd mixture of argument, scolding and sarcasm, with many marks of kindness, which, together with his own perplexities and inconsistencies, give us a true picture of the extremities to which Southern ministers are driven in regard to this subject. When they have made up their minds that *slavery is wrong*, they will learn how to deal with it, but till then they must continue to be like "waves of the sea, driven of the winds and tossed."

Dr. Rice's letters indicate a vigorous and gifted mind, and he endeavors to treat the subject with candor and kindness,

yet some parts of his letters, even in these points, are really objectionable. He has not quite so much *meekness* in receiving rebuke, as he has *power* and *energy* in administering it, but on the whole, we have seen nothing from a Southern pen, on this subject, which has so little that is offensive in language to Northern minds.

The letter to Dr. Adams is in reply to his "South side view of Slavery," a book which ought never to have been written. It is enough for Southern ministers to apologise for and defend the system of slavery, but it is an intense grief to the Christian heart, when an able and respected minister enters the field in defence of a cause, so utterly repugnant, not only to the feelings of most who bear the christian name, but to the great majority of the non-professing world. Dr. Adams has outstripped Dr. Rice, in his zeal to help the slaveholder, and both these gentlemen are laboring under the strange illusion, that the relation of master and slave is not sinful—an illusion which would quickly be dispelled, if they and their families were delivered over to the absolute authority and disposal of others, who might or might not abuse their power. A brief experience of the blessings of slavery in a cotton-field, would prove a most instructive and convincing argument, on this point.

The day of free and full discussion of this subject has now come. We must approach each other with kindness, but yet with firmness and decision. If the position that slavery is not sinful should be established in the world, we think there are none who would mourn over it more than these justly esteemed ministers—let this sentiment pervade the public mind and work out its necessary results, and these gentlemen would be among the first to condemn that relation, which, strangely enough, they now sanction and defend.

# LETTERS TO REV. N. L. RICE, D. D.

## FIRST LETTER.

Rev. and dear Sir,—

It has happened to you, as to other writers for the public, that your "Letters on Slavery" have fallen under the eye of critics, who, it may be, are not remarkable for candor, and perhaps are more anxious to expose its defects, than to imitate the kind and christian spirit, which, in the main, you have manifested. But if you have done anything to benefit the slave, or to correct the notions of anti-slavery men, a close analysis of your arguments will not lessen their value, or impair their usefulness. If, on the other hand, it shall appear that you have made important mistakes and omissions, and especially, if I am able to shew that your positions are not only at variance with the gospel of Christ, but opposed to those innate notions of equity which are common to all men, I hope you will not impute these views to any unreasonable prejudice, or any desire to do injustice to slave-holders.

I have not avowed my name, but I have assumed one,* whose mystic letters are remembered with deep interest by every reader of Puritan history, not that I would compare anything I can do, to those noble monuments of Puritan talent, and the sorely tasked ingenuity, which conveyed its

* The word "Smectymnuus" was composed of the initials of the names of five Puritan Divines, who wrote a celebrated treatise in favor of their principles, under this title, in a period of persecution, and the authors were unknown for many years. Subsequently it appeared that their names were as follows: Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow.

lessons of wisdom and its demands for civil and religious freedom, under this politic enigma; but haply I may wish to visit the South, as I have formerly done, and if my work and my name precede me, I shall not be likely to share so largely in Southern hospitality as my friend Dr. Adams did, whose "South side view" was so happily attempered to Southern optics, for your "peculiar institution" has left little room for the outflow of charity towards an abolitionist. Yet I hope again to visit the South, and would to God I might see it overspread, like my own New England, with churches, villages and schools, instead of the negro cabin, the forced labor, and the dull monotony of a land under the curse of slavery.

I have avowed myself an Abolitionist. Yes, Sir, however unpopular the name, I am not only willing to bear it, but to count it all honor to be thus designated. It is a name which in the Southern States is connected with all that is fanatical and hateful; in England and Scotland, yea in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, it is associated with all that is honorable and praise worthy, and the friend of slavery is deemed false to his innate convictions, false to humanity and to God.

I am, moreover, a Presbyterian of the Old School. From my childhood, I have been instructed in the doctrines of this branch of the church. I love her faith, her polity, her institutions, and her worship. I have sat under her shadow with great delight, and have drank from her living fountains the waters of life and salvation. God grant that every cloud which eclipses her glory may pass away, and that she may defend the liberties of others, as nobly, as faithfully and successfully, as she has battled for her own.

You, dear Sir, are a minister of Christ; you have been "anointed to preach good tidings to the poor, to proclaim liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison to them who are bound," and to you, in common with others, belongs that solemn and awful admonition, "Son of man, I have set thee a watchman to the house of Israel, therefore thou shalt hear the word from my mouth, and warn them from me. If thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I re-

quire at thine hand." It is in the light of the Holy Scriptures, that I now invite you to contemplate a widely different view of christian obligation, from the one you have presented to the world. It is not limited to the narrow line of selfish or sectional observation, but its broad and comprehensive outline is sketched by the pen of inspiration in those heaven-breathing words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

You are unwilling to discuss the right or wrong of slavery in the abstract, but you may not thus dismiss this all important point. Much of what you say has no value until this previous question is settled. The mode of treating a subject depends greatly upon its moral character, and much of your reasoning, which is very well as applied to a *physical evil*, is totally out of place, when applied to a *moral wrong*. Calamity and crime are widely different things. You have no hesitation in giving to fraud and injustice their proper names and their just application, as they exist in society at large, but it seems these moral features must vanish, when slavery is discussed,—so that while *single exercises* of injustice may be condemned, a *system of injustice* may be vindicated; that which is wrong upon a limited scale, becomes right, when it stands forth in a menacing aspect and gigantic proportions. This is the false and hateful logic of slavery; it takes advantage of its own wrong, and claims immunity, because its usurpations have risen to such degrees of influence, that they cannot safely be attacked. You tell us we have treated the subject unwisely, because we call it a sin and the slaveholder a sinner, but we have not so learned the Scriptures. Fraud and injustice are always sins, modified by no climate or color, and are subjects of just rebuke, whether found in the stealing of money or the robbery of human rights. If expediency may sometimes restrain the utterance of deserved rebuke, it will not permit us to call "evil good and good evil." Was Nathan harsh or unwise, when he said to David, "Thou art the man?" Not so, nor did David so understand it. The royal penitent was deeply humbled, and confessed his sin in the deepest contrition and self-abhorrence. Was Elijah unwise when he uttered the maledictions of heaven upon the spoiler

and murderer of Naboth? In your ministry of warning and mercy to man, you have learned to distinguish between the sin and the sinner, unsparingly denouncing the one, and pitying, with divine compassion the other. So would we deal with slaveholders, and if the language of rebuke is inconsistent with christian love, then the stern demands of religion must cease to be urged, and the thunders of Sinai may slumber in the cloud that covered the mount.

But you will ask me, is slavery a sin *per se*, and under this subterfuge you would veil the enormity of its transgressions. I answer fearlessly, it is a sin, as murder is sin, as theft is sin, as injustice is sin. Cases there may be where slaveholders are only *nominally* guilty. The same is true of many acts, which in view of human law are called murder and theft. But we do not ask the question whether murder or theft are sins *per se*. A man may be a nominal slaveholder from necessity, and yet be a pious and benevolent man. A murderer in the judgment of man, may be acquitted at the bar of God. In both these cases, a false judgment exists. There is neither slave-holding nor murder in either case. But when a man kills another from *malice*, it is murder; when a man holds slaves for *gain*, it is injustice and fraud. Here is the true distinction. Any man who holds slaves for a *benevolent end*, who remunerates their labor, and is only prevented from manumitting them by circumstances which he cannot control, is involved in *misfortune*, but not in *guilt;* but he who holds slaves for his *own gain*, to increase his wealth, or to promote his own selfish ends, is as truly guilty of injustice and fraud, as if he were a common thief, and he is all the more guilty, because he robs the slave of rights far more precious than gold. A *single act* of robbery dooms a thief to the State-prison; a *system* of robbery is justified and defended and is no bar to honor and respectability in the world. Do you, Sir, believe these to be the ethics of the Bible—that blessed book which assures us that without love and justice to man, there can be no evidence of favor with God? If you will not call slavery a sin, to be consistent, you must cease to warn men of their sins, and adopt the

Antinomian theory, that the promises of the gospel are the only themes becoming a gospel minister.

When, therefore, you rebuke us because we treat slavery as a *crime*, and not merely a *calamity;* because we cannot view it in the same category of evils as famine, or earthquake, or pestilence, but as a series of moral acts, for which man is justly accountable, we may well complain of unfairness. Your reasoning proceeds mainly on the assumption that slavery is an unavoidable evil, and you ask of us to treat the matter very much as you would expect us to behave, if one of your cities was desolated by pestilence or fire.

But no, dear Sir, in the vital language of Lord Brougham, "we must dispel from your minds the wild and guilty fantasy, that man can hold property in his fellow-man." We must bring the system of slavery to a law, written on the consciences of men not less distinctly than in the word of God, even that law of uprightness and integrity which renders to all men their due. We must not deal with the voluntary slaveholder, as if he were a *helpless cripple*, but as a *wilful criminal.* If he pretends that he has been educated in different views of slavery and does not see its injustice as we do, we must tell him that ignorance is a crime, where the means of knowledge are at hand, and that this plea proves far too much; it would equally justify the Hindoo suttee, the Catholic auto de fe, and all the atrocities which bigotry and mental blindness can inflict. If when we denounce the sin of slavery, the slaveholder is roused to madness because his craft is in danger, shall we therefore cease our crusade against his sin? As well might you blame the Apostles for preaching the gospel at Ephesus, because the whole city was thrown into commotion by it. I suppose Demetrius and his fellow craftsmen had as good an opinion of their business, as slave owners can by any possibility entertain of theirs.

If you could dispel from the minds of your readers the conviction that slavery is sinful; if you could satisfy them that it is merely an evil, and not a crime, then your reasoning would be in point, and the anti-slavery men of the north would think they had greatly erred; but you are dealing with

men who cannot thus be deluded, and your rebukes which otherwise would be reasonable and just, are as powerless as the arrow of Priam on the shield of Achilles. To the minds of those who believe slavery to be sinful you confound all moral distinctions. The strength of your mental delusion astonishes us. We are amazed that you do not recoil from the dreadful results to which you are forced. We wonder that you can preach a gospel of righteousness, and yet defend a system which is fruitful of all unrighteousness; I say defend it, for it will yet be seen that notwithstanding you refuse to pronounce it right or wrong, you actually attempt to justify it from the Scriptures.

But you ask us to view the question of slavery in its Providential aspect. Your request is reasonable, but I apprehend it will add nothing to your cause. All the dealings of Providence are fit subjects of notice to the Christian, but the *revealed will* of God, and not his *providential dealings*, is the rule of our duty. Was not the bondage of Israel, an appointment of God? But the duties required from Pharaoh and enjoined upon Moses, recognized the sinful agencies by which this bondage was perpetuated. God intended to overrule it all for the display of his own glory, but was not every step, in this process of deliverance, conducted by responsible agents? God did not the less punish Pharoah for the sin of slavery, or excuse Moses from the dangerous duty of confronting the Egyptian king. The truth is, the providences of God must be interpreted by his word. If they seem to intimate a rule of duty opposed to his word, all such intimations are to be rejected. The pretensions of Faith and Providence must be tried by an infallible standard, or they will prove blind and treacherous guides. The fact that God has permitted slavery, is no excuse for the slaveholder, and may not silence the rebukes he deserves. If God designs good to the African race by means of slavery, he will accomplish it by his *overruling*, but not by his *approving* providence. He may design a glorious deliverance for Africa by means of slavery, and yet its agents and friends will not fail to find their punishment, even as Pharaoh did, though it be in the depths of

the Red Sea. "The blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church," but they who kindled the fires of persecution have gone to a just and awful retribution.

But, in my apprehension, the Providence of God has far different teachings on this momentous subject. I am no interpreter of the divine mysteries, and many who have sought to unravel them, have fallen into fanaticism and delusion; but it is no fanaticism to say, we are a nation of sinners—and it is only within a limited circle, that slavery is not pronounced a sin of the most atrocious and heaven-daring character. We may therefore expect that for our national sins, the deserved judgments of heaven will not long be delayed. I cannot but fear that this sin of slavery, approved and justified by so many national acts, is to prove such a punishment of our public offences, as shall be a wonder to the world. Why may not America, for this and its other gigantic iniquities, aggravated by its profession of the gospel, find the grave of its institutions and the ruin of its liberties, both civil and religious, in the fiery gulf, which slavery is opening before us. I tremble for my country, said Jefferson, and he was only a believer in natural religion—"I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just."

But there is still another view of the Providence of God touching this matter. It is the deep conviction of numbers among us, that the American Church has not fulfilled its mission in the matter of slavery. We firmly believe that the Christian Church has had a work to do, which she has shamefully neglected. In great mercy and with manifest approbation, her labors have been employed in many departments of religion, but she has refused to enter this field of labor. God does not need her services; in his awful sovereignty he may and does employ the wrath of man to praise him. If his church, redeemed by atoning blood, will not hear the cry of the oppressed, he will raise up and employ other agencies. Political events are in his hands; he may desolate our land with blood; or peace may reign among us, and he may employ the infidelity of Parker, the violence of Garrison, and the fury of fanatical reformers, to do that work

which his own people refuse to perform—nay, he may crush the church under the weight of its own sins, and from its ruins, he may build another and more beautiful temple, in which the sons of departed prophets shall "preach righteousness in the great congregation."

Have you not, dear Sir, gazed in wonder and awe at the forces which God employs in his moral kingdom? When Israel rebelled, he sent prophets among them; when their message was rejected, he ravaged their cities with pestilence and famine; and when they still refused to obey, he sent the Assyrian host and the bands of the Chaldeans, to accomplish the very ends for which his people refused to labor; and when Israel was ruined by her persistent rebellion, he punished the nations who had humbled her, and poured out his fury upon the heathen, who in their own wickedness had accomplished his will. "Clouds and darkness are round about him, but justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne."

It has been to me, a most affecting illustration of his Providence, that God has employed the talents of infidel writers, from the deistical Jefferson, to the bold infidelity of Theodore Parker, in the work of emancipation, and that too with signal success. Jehu executed God's judgments upon the house of Ahab, and he had his temporal reward, but he took no heed to walk in the ways of God. Garrison and his associates are sending a cry through the land, which ought to have swelled from the hill tops of our Zion, and they are fulfilling the divine purposes, by doing the work of the church, while, at the same time, they scourge and deride that church, whose members go up to her Sabbaths, her solemn feasts and her holy places of communion, with garments defiled with blood. I say it with unspeakable grief, but with the most solemn conviction of its truth, that the attitude of the American church, in regard to slavery, has thrown a stumbling-block in the way, over which numbers have plunged into hopeless infidelity. "It must be that offences come, but woe, woe to him, by whom the offence cometh."

But you tell us that multitudes of slaves have been converted, and that abolitionists have no share in this good work. We admit the fact, and we rejoice that the bitter cup of slavery has been, in some degree, neutralized by the healing waters of the gospel. But God deals with men as he pleases. Thousands have been converted by instrumentalities, which God has overruled for this benevolent end. The gospel may be a savor of life unto life to the poor, oppressed hearer, while it is a savor of death unto death to the preacher. It has ever been the purpose of God to honor his gospel. Because the labors of Mr. Finney have been the means of conversion to many, you would not justify the extravagances and fanaticism of this remarkable man. No more, because the gospel has been preached to slaves by slave-holding ministers, would you expect that its truths would have no effect on the conscience. The fact that God blesses the preaching, is no proof that he approves the character of the preacher. But waiving this, I have no wish to deny that much good has been effected by the preaching of the gospel among slaves; it is matter of thankfulness and rejoicing, and every true Christian will bless God for it. Nor have I the least doubt, that many who have not yet discovered the sin of slavery are sincerely good men, and preach among the slaves with earnest desires for their salvation, and God approves and blesses their labors; but it is true, that anti-slavery ministers have no direct agency in this work. They are not permitted to stand on Southern ground and proclaim the gospel of liberty to the captive; human statutes are too slow for this mortal offence; they are driven by mob law from these scenes of christian labor, if haply they escape with their lives. Methodism may go among you, in its wildest fanaticism, if it will tolerate slavery; but the solemn demands of the gospel, its direct enforcements of justice and equity, cannot for a moment be endured.

It is a fact beyond dispute, that slavery has given an *Antinomian* character to the Southern church. I appeal to you, Sir, and ask, are not the *purposes* of God, in regard to the children of Ham, used as a plea for the defence of slavery?

Is not the judicial curse pronounced upon Canaan, often appealed to in justification of the system? Does not the divine *purpose* thus become a rule of duty? This perversion, if carried out in other views of God's designs as they respect the salvation of men, would paralyse christian effort, and fill the land with antinomian fatalism and delusion.

Your next point relates to the Colonization Society. I consider this Society as standing out of the line of argument in this discussion. It was never instituted for the removal of slavery; I believe it never made any such pretensions. It is my firm belief that its design was benevolent and praiseworthy. I have willingly contributed to its funds, and in common with the great majority of Northern Christians have rejoiced in its success. But as a measure looking to the abolition of slavery, it has never been esteemed of much value, for the moment this was understood to be its design, it would be abandoned and denounced by the South—and it is well known that many planters at the South, who are professing Christians, are opposed to it; but still it has accomplished much good, more probably than many of its original friends desired. It has demonstrated the capacity of the African for self-government; it has founded a prosperous and peaceful colony, and given to it Christian institutions; it has exerted a kind and beneficent influence, and we have no sympathy with those who denounce it. But it cannot demolish the strong entrenchments of slavery. The moment it encroaches upon your "peculiar institution," the South will hang out the signal for its utter extinction. But there is no such fear. Colonization is too weak to grapple with such a monster; but she displays the prosperity of free Liberia, in striking contrast with the blighted prospects and withering industry of the slave-ridden South.

We come now to consider your view of slavery, as apart from its providential aspects it involves great *moral questions*. Among these you enumerate the questions:—Is it the duty of masters at once to manumit their slaves? If so, what is to be done with them, if the laws forbid manumission? Again, what is to be done with those who have intermarried

with slaves belonging to other men? And out of these "other difficult and complicated questions arise, which require patient and thorough examination." You do not state these questions with any view to answer them, but as a reason why the subject should be kindly met and carefully considered. And the remainder of your second letter is mostly occupied in stating the inconsistencies of the North, in pleading the bad example of some of her best men in the darker ages of slavery, and in rebukes not altogether kind and conciliatory, of the Northern way of presenting this subject.

It is readily admitted that the questions you propose are exceedingly difficult of solution, and they demand of us all that you claim in the way of patience and kindness; but I have yet to learn that our Southern friends are willing to ask these questions, or consider them at all, with any view to emancipation. Individuals, indeed, have in many cases manumitted their slaves, and have thus given a practical reply to these interrogatories. They have found out a way to liberate the captive, and have seen the solution of these questions to be far less difficult than was apprehended. When the South gets so far as to be willing to consider the subject, and take up its complex and difficult character, they will be entitled to the largest charity and sympathy of the North; but till they manifest some desire to know their duty, it is useless to argue the point. One thing is certain, when Southern Christians feel that slavery is wrong, and when their consciences are deeply disquieted about it, they will ask in humble sincerity, Lord what wilt thou have me to do? And they need not doubt that the path of duty will be made plain. But so long as they maintain that slavery is right, and attempt to justify it from the Bible, I think they are not entitled to argue from the difficulty of their position. It is absolutely certain that slaveholders can cease to be holders of slaves for *gain;* whenever they choose, they can abandon the wages of unrighteousness; they can be nominal slaveholders, paying their servants and doing that which is just and equal. Shew me such a slave-owner as this, and I honor him, more than I honor an abolitionist who never held slaves. He hath done what he

could, and will be accepted of God. But alas! such examples are rare indeed, and you, Sir, may ask these questions with a much better grace, when you can shew me that professedly Christian slaveholders hold their slaves for these *benevolent ends*, and not for *their own gain*. Shew us that they repudiate, for their own benefit, these wages of sin, and the crimson garments of slavery become whiter than snow.

You complain much of the bitter language of abolitionists towards slaveholders, and I freely admit you have reason to complain. But you do not consider how hard it is to use soft words, when dealing with giant sins. Kindness and love may kindle language into a most vehement flame, when directed against sin, and your own eloquent and impressive sermons are not wanting in the language of terror, which is yet, I doubt not, the language of love.

You bring up President Edwards as a slaveholder, and you might have added the name of the honored and excellent Samuel Davies, than whom a brighter star never shone in this western sky. But what does all this prove? Only that good men in dark ages are apt to imitate the sins of the times. Calvin's views of religious toleration would be criminal in these days—they were so then, but in less degree. And all these matters may be answered in this one Scripture passage:—

"The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent."

And this, in truth, is the only ground on which slavery can be palliated. It is certain that good men, as they enter upon the active duties of life, find many evils, which they would gladly remove, *as evils*, but they do not suddenly reach the conviction that these evils are moral obliquities, actual sins, and that they are bound to oppose them as such. This well known fact, apologises for, while it does not justify the persecution of the Quakers in New England, the execution of supposed witches, and other sins, which our Puritan fathers were too slow to discover and abandon. Yet it must be admitted, that the plea of neglect or ignorance, where the means of knowledge are possessed, is not satisfactory, and a truly

pious man will not be likely to satisfy himself in this way—under a consciousness of newly discovered sin, he will humble himself before God, and fly to the blood of cleansing, as his only hope of forgiveness. Such was the conduct of Paul; he verily thought he did God service when he persecuted the church; but when the law of God entered his conscience, he acknowledged himself the chief of sinners.

In your third letter, you dwell much upon the unfairness of abolitionists, in their representations of the treatment of slaves. Doubtless many cases of cruelty have been overstated, it is equally certain that many more have never been told; circumstances are not favorable for the developement of these cases. I think you are mistaken in the assertion, that if one murders a single slave, the fact is published throughout the country. I have reason to believe that the awful secrets of many a plantation are not revealed to the public eye. The sands of Carolina and the soil of Missouri have alike been wet with innocent blood, which once nerved the arm of the helpless sufferer to toil night and day for a thankless and inhuman master. The testimony of the slaves themselves cannot be had; they dare not complain; and the plantations of the South are seldom trodden by the feet of Northern freemen, save only those who travel for pleasure or gain, and their brief stay in the pleasant home of the master, is but too apt to give them a "South side view of slavery." Yet in spite of all these hindrances, the cry of the oppressed, the groans of murdered innocence, are sometimes heard, and often enough too to assure us, that in very many cases, nothing but the cupidity of the master stands between him and the death of his slave, and that passion and cruelty will oft times triumph even over avarice, and the voice of his brother's blood will cry unto God from the ground. Masters and overseers will not report the death of their slaves, when occasioned by cruelty or neglect—the survivors dare not, and other witnesses there are none.

I must tell you, dear Sir, that the cause of the irritation of the Southern mind, is not the violent language of the abolitionists, which I admit has often been unwise and unkind,

for conscious innocence is not so easily irritated. It lies deeper, far deeper, even in that solemn sanctuary, where awful thoughts hurry to and fro in the midnight hour, where the unwelcome light penetrates into regions where darkness is loved, because the sinner's deeds are evil. Yes, Sir, the conscience of the slaveholder is not at rest. *Your own is not at rest*, while you defend an institution, which you seem to think is sustained by a just God. All along your pages its sad apprehensions are visible. Its struggles with the truth are painfully evident, and the distressing warfare agitates your own soul, as you contemplate the duty of the "watchman," and the solemn reckonings of the Judgment day. With all your mistakes and errors, I believe you will stand among the justified at last, by a Redeemer's righteousness, but if there could be grief in heaven, the memory of what you have done for slavery, would make you weep in the presence of angels and the spirits of the just made perfect.

But will the Southern churches hear us, if we come in the language of Christian love and with the meekness of the gospel, to point out the sin of slavery. Fidelity is equally important as love, nay it is a branch of that tree of life. May we come then with all sincerity and kindness to remonstrate with you on this momentous subject? Will you exercise the virtues of patience and forbearance while we attempt to reason with you in the spirit of love? On this point we confess we have no hope. You will not hear us; the language of denunciation from the South is louder and fiercer than the remonstrances of the North. *You* may come and defend your institutions in our cities and villages with no opposition; but the moment *we* stand on Southern ground, to proclaim the sin of slavery, we are driven with violence from your midst, or confined in your prisons to die. Slavery is the law of violence; it will not listen to the voice of love; it hides itself from the light; it cannot bear the voice of reproof. Its hospitality to ministers who apologize for it is ample and large—to its faithful reprover, it offers imprisonment, or exile.

You quote the case of Rev. Dr. Adams, as proof that abolitionists are not willing to hear the truth as to the treatment of slaves. The reason is simply this. Dr. Adams believes slavery to be right; he justifies it from the Bible; his testimony therefore is not satisfactory; he is not an impartial witness. Moreover, he could not, in his brief sojourn at the South, become acquainted with the general treatment of slaves on the plantations; he saw them in the cities and families of the South, where its form is milder and its aspects far less forbidding. But enough is known of Dr. Adams' prejudices and pro-slavery feelings, to weaken his testimony and diminish its influence on Northern minds. Besides this, many masters, naturally kind and humane, do not themselves know how their slaves are treated; the business is in the hands of overseers, and the bloody discipline of slavery is kept out of sight. The hospitality of the master's mansion and the cold comforts of the negro's cabin are not often seen in contrast. The one is an experience which too often blinds the eye—the other an object not likely to afford pleasure. I suppose if any one should write as able a defence of the abolitionists at the South, he would have found worse treatment from Southern *meekness and love*, than Dr. Adams did from Northern *fanaticism and infidelity*. He would probably have been driven with violence from the regions of slavery.

Do you believe, dear Sir, that the spirit of the South towards abolitionists is any kinder or better than theirs towards the South? Have you no words of severity for them? Must all the reproach fall on one side? Are not the bitter epithets employed by the South, coupled with the violence inflicted on the persons of abolitionists, a match for the opprobrious language, but unrevenging opposition of the North. Southern men may travel freely and fearlessly all over the North, and say what they please. The graves of martyred abolitionists, the lynch law inflicted on the peaceful preacher, who spoke kind words for the slave, are fatal demonstrations, that "Justice has fallen in your streets and equity cannot enter."

And even your own pages, written mainly in a Christian spirit, are at times deformed by the bitter language which you denounce in abolitionists. You speak of Mr. Garrison as a "blaspheming infidel." I have no sympathy with the religious views of this gentleman; I dissent entirely from most of his doctrines; and he has betrayed and injured the sacred cause he pleads, by his wild notions of church organizations, civil polity and woman's rights; but Mr. Garrison is not an infidel, unless you will involve in the charge, the respectable sect of Quakers, whose religious views he adopts. Mr. Garrison was never, to my knowledge, known to blaspheme. If there is aught of infidelity in his character, which I do not believe, it is the pro-slavery tendencies of the church which has produced it. Nevertheless such words from you are unseemly, and I rejoice that they are rare exceptions to your usually cautious and dignified style.

But I must pause. Gladly would I leave the subject forever. But it may not be. The church I love has retrograded on this all-important subject;* her position is unworthy of her holy profession and her christian aims. She must free herself from these shackles; she must not be enslaved to slavery; her holy doctrines, her enlightened polity, her blessed influences, must be divorced from this accursed institution. We cry to God for her deliverance; we firmly believe it will come. In the spirit of christian love, we will do all in our power to hasten it.

Most sincerely yours,

SMECTYMNUUS.

* The following is the language of Dr. R. I. Breckenridge, in 1834:—

"I do believe and have long and repeatedly maintained, that slavery is a *sin* to him who in any way supports it. In 1833 I did refuse to sit as a corresponding member of the Synod of Kentucky, after that body refused to say that God's law condemned slavery. To put an end to slavery, we are all bound to use legal means where they exist, and *moral means always*."

Dr. Breckenridge is high authority among Presbyterians, and though foiled in his benevolent purposes, he represented the views of many Presbyterian ministers, who at that time were not afraid to speak out on this subject.

# LETTERS TO REV. N. L. RICE, D. D.

## SECOND LETTER.

Rev. and dear Sir,—

It was my complaint that you would not pronounce of slavery that it was a sin against God; but in your fourth letter you take up the so called Bible argument in such form, as leaves us no doubt, that in your view, the system is lawful, and that its abuses only are sinful. You tell us that the Bible "condemns all robbery, oppression and cruelty, and tolerates slavery." I shall leave you to unriddle this paradox, when you can prove that compulsory servitude is neither robbery, oppression or cruelty—in other words, that to rob a man of his liberty, without crime, *is not robbery;* to compel him to labor for your benefit, *is not oppression;* to *sell his wife and children, is not cruelty.* You may construct a better argument for polygamy from the Bible, than you have found for slavery, for polygamy was tolerated without the checks imposed upon slavery. If you should be so unhappy as to convince any who read your pages that the Bible really does make it a righteous thing, and allows its practice among Christians, and therefore they infer that it cannot be from God, your nice distinctions between slavery and injustice, will have led that soul to a ruin, for which you are justly and awfully responsible.

It is true that God permitted servitude among his people, but it was a widely different thing from Southern slavery. It is true that God permitted and commanded his people to

destroy the heathen; but this is no rule for us, but had its special purpose in the orderings of his providence. It is true that Onesimus was sent back to Philemon, but as a brother beloved and not as a servant. It was a kind, yet pungent rebuke to Philemon, who in the first dawnings of grace, had not discovered the injustice of Roman slavery, and who was now under apostolic injunction to treat Onesimus, no longer as a servant, but as a christian brother. We have reason to believe that Philemon was convinced of the injustice of slavery, and that he liberated Onesimus, who was employed with Tychicus in conveying the letter of Paul to the Colossians.

But you will not feel the force of the Bible commands, to wrong no man, to love our brother and even our enemies, to relieve the hungry, to deliver the oppressed and release the captive, until you believe it wrong for man to enslave his fellow man. Alas, the sad delusion, "the wild and guilty fancy, that man may hold property in his fellow man." It is this which closes and bars the soul against the light of truth. Your own virtuous and intelligent mind is inaccessible on this subject to the most convincing arguments. But this shall not hinder my charity, for I remember with shame how slowly those bars were removed from my own mind. I remember, we are sanctified but in part, and unholy prejudices may blind us for a time to the clearest light, and close our hearts to the pulsations of christian love.

You tell us, in the close of your fourth letter, that the "Presbyterian Church has refused to pervert God's word, to make it either denounce or sanction slavery." You are aware, however, that numbers within her pale, both ministers and laymen, feel that she is in a false position. Her robes are soiled and her march is heavy and dreary over this accursed and enchanted ground, but like her elder sister of Scotland, she will be disenthralled—she will yet triumph over this inveterate foe to her prosperity and peace. She will proclaim an allegiance to God, which stretches beyond and walks over the sinful statutes of men. She will confess her sins, and return to the Lord, and her mission of love and salvation,

shall break the bonds of the oppressor and let the oppressed go free.

I am unwilling to answer your fifth letter. If it had more truth and less sophistry—more grief and less sarcasm—more solicitude for the slave and less for the master; if it sounded the gospel trumpet more, and the Southern trumpet less, I should meet your argument with better feeling and with stronger hope of its kindness and sincerity. The amount of your letter is, that you invite us to come and preach among you the gospel, as we understand it in its bearings on slavery; but you have not given us the friendly warning, "Beware of spring-guns, man-traps are set here." I know of no command to covet or pursue the crown of martyrdom. "If they persecute you in one city, flee ye to another," was the direction of our Lord. It may be our duty to face the consequences of preaching the truth, or it may not be. Perhaps it might be well for you to set us the example, for it cannot be doubted, that many Southern ministers would be glad to preach against slavery, if they dared. I am not sure that you would not be glad to utter some bitter things against it, if the risk was not too great. For myself, I should have deemed myself safer in preaching the gospel, as we understand it, in Pagan Rome, in the days of the Antonines, than in Charleston or Savannah. When the South is willing to hear that branch of the gospel which proclaims liberty to the captive, it will be time enough for you to invite us to this field of labor.

In your sixth letter, you have another brief commentary on the difficulty of emancipating slaves, founded on the question, Where shall we place them? In this connection you bring up again the blessings of colonization, and tell us that abolitionists have attempted to shut the door upon this method of emancipation; and so they have, for the door is so small, that the long and ever multiplying procession of slaves would never get through it. Colonization is excellent for certain ends it proposes, but as a means of extinction to slavery, it has no value at all. You must first *destroy the market* for slaves, if you would drive slavery out of the world.

You must "hew down the tree, cut off its branches, shake off its leaves and scatter its fruit," if you would withdraw its deadly night-shade from your civil, religious and social institutions. But this letter is mainly a repetition of what you have said before, and it needs no farther remark.

Your next letter refers to the efforts which may be made to secure freedom to the slave. You mention three, viz: Moral suasion, Stratagem, and Political action. The first you approve as consistent with the gospel—the two latter you condemn. Moral suasion we cannot use, for you will not let us come, or send tracts or books on the subject. Stratagem is the necessity of the slave, and if you were enslaved or in prison wrongfully, you would probably think it lawful to escape even as Paul did, by being let down by a basket over the wall. The Christians of Damascus, finding moral suasion of no use, against rigorous penal statutes, had no scruple in employing strategy, and the apostle himself was, no doubt, very glad to escape in this way. He did not expect a miracle to be performed, and made use of such means as he knew belonged to his natural rights; and in justifying this mode of proceeding, as you probably would, you justify the slave who attempts to secure his own rights in the same way. Political action you deprecate as arraying the North against the South, and tending to disunion. Let us suppose, for a moment, that the long threatened measures of the South were adopted, and the Union was peaceably dissolved. In such case, the free States would not consent to retain a single slave State, as it would completely mar their confederacy—nor would the South consent to retain any but slave States. Let us now look at the probable consequences. Maryland and Virginia, on the east, would be border territory. Tennessee and Kentucky would make the south-western border. It would of course be impossible for these States to keep their slaves securely in the vicinity of free States, over which no Fugitive Slave Law could in that case operate. Consequently the value of slaves would decline, and the ultimate effect would be emancipation. It would be a political necessity. This would push slavery

farther South,—where again the border States would feel the insecurity of their slaves, and the same causes would weaken or overthrow it there—and thus, from very necessity, slavery would find its grave at home. The South have desired dissolution—the North has always opposed it; but a change is coming over us. If the South persists in her claim for the Fugitive Slave Law, and for the addition of other slave States,—the North will grant her desire, and give her a peaceable dismission from the confederacy; but the moment this is done, she must get ready for the exit of slavery—it will follow as certainly as morning succeeds to night. It shall be overruled for good. Her lands will advance in value and be covered with a new population; her wealth and her glory will increase—for the institution of slavery, abhorred by God and man, shall no longer darken her sun-light or paralyze her energies.

It is pleasant to read what you say of the Fugitive Slave Law. It is the outburst of an honest and generous feeling. I am a friend to law and order, and I would quietly take the penalty of performing a christian duty in violation of this unholy statute, for obedience to it is out of the question—it is a monstrous deformity, which cannot stand, and must be crushed under the weight of its own sins.

I am sorry to find you opposed to the doctrine of the non-extension of slavery. You are willing it should be extended, in the strange belief, that the difficulty of removing it, will be lessened. All experience is against you here. The more it extends, the larger will be its demands. It has always been aggressive. But in one view you are right—its last aggressions—i. e. the Fugitive Slave Law—and the repeal of the Missouri compromise will be its death. It is an old maxim, "Whom the gods mean to destroy, they first infatuate."

In your eighth letter, we abolitionists come in for a signal share of reproach. We "have hindered the cause of emancipation, done injury to religion and to our country." These are grave charges, and ought to be sustained by irrefragable proof. It is fit here, that I should remind you, that Mr. Gar-

rison's party is too small*—its principles are too repellant to exert any considerable influence. Its platform is so broad, that it takes in every discontented, unhappy ranter, who may be opposed to human enactments, or who may go for radical measures in any or every department of society. Its force is greatly weakened by its appendages of woman's rights, the overthrow of the church, and the destruction of civil government. But behind all this fanaticism, there is a calm and steady anti-slavery sentiment, unshackled by Mr. Garrison's appendages, which is finding its way into every man's conscience. It disregards the false cry of disunion; it heeds not the murmur of politicians, the alarm of statesmen, nor the terrors of the slaveholder. It is pressing into the high places of power; it is arming the North and West, with an energy, before which nothing of slavery can stand, and behind which, when it has passed over the land, nothing will remain. It has enlisted the public conscience; it enters the public prayer; it pervades the church. Its march is onward, and whoever will stop its advancing wheels will be crushed to powder. The South has pulled down the vengeance upon her own head. She challenged the North to a contest,—and from her lakes and rivers, from the far West to the farthest East, her marshalled hosts are pressing on for conflict. The grand arena is the halls of Congress. Compromise and policy and craft have done their work. The issue is now on its own merits. The question is Freedom or Slavery, and its momentous results, the future alone can reveal.

In your ninth letter you propose to defend the Presbyterian Church against the charges of abolitionists. I have not the least doubt, that she has done much to alleviate the condition of slaves, by infusing the softening influences of the gospel into the bitter cup of slavery. Ler her have credit for

* I have elsewhere alluded to Mr. Garrison's influence as being very considerable, but this influence must rather be spoken of in relation to his pioneer position and before he connected his no-government theories with the cause of Emancipation. He has done much to arouse the public mind, but he has had no skill in directing public sentiment, and by his gross mistakes has retarded and injured the cause of the slave. In his private character, he is unexceptionable; in his intercourse with men, his temper is mild and amiable, and no reasonable person will refuse him credit for ability and energy in defending his positions.

all. I rejoice in whatever elevates her position and sanctifies her influence in the world. But she, in common with the other branches of the church, has stopped far short of her duty. She has left undone what she ought to have done. It is in vain to lop off excrescences here and there, so long as the accursed tree is left in its full vigor and strength. You say truly that freedom is no great blessing to the ignorant and vicious; but that they should be kept ignorant, is the dreadful necessity of the system. Slavery must shut up the book of knowledge; it must degrade its victims, in order to fit them for the condition of slaves. They must not learn their own rights. It is one of the atrocities of slavery, that it must darken the mind, blunt the sensibilities, and pervert the conscience of the slave. It does indeed permit the gospel to be preached with certain limitations; but it avails itself of the gospel's hold on the conscience, to inculcate the duty of submission—the obligations of the slaves, and the wickedness of disobeying masters. The other side of the picture never comes into view, only as it is seen by the light of the cross and the love of the Redeemer; and many a trembling fugitive has been guided by this light, not only to the consolations of religion, but to the peaceful enjoyment of his rights in a land of freedom. We may not boast of what our church has done for slaves, when we consider what she has refused to do.

You speak of the share which other denominations have had in the work of converting the slaves. In Georgia alone, we are told there are 14,000 colored members in the Baptist churches. I would not depreciate the good of this, but I find that in 1851 there were 422 churches of the Hard Shell Baptists in Georgia, comprising about one fourth of all in the country. If they are members of these Antinomian churches, whose lax morality is proverbial, it will not be contended that they have gained much by this kind of religion. Nor does my observation of the influence of Methodism, in its Arminian doctrines, its violent impulses of animal feeling, its tempests of passion, its wild and unaccountable and unintelligent extasies, inspire much confidence in the real conver-

sion of the great mass of its professors; nor do I believe that you place much reliance upon the fruits of its revivals. Methodism does not discriminate; it fills many minds with its raptures; but the revival dies. Temptation comes with its blasts, and the forest which was lovely in its green, and beautiful in its promise, has fallen like grass under the scythe of the mower. Some indeed survive, and many a blessed influence has gone forth from this denomination; but my estimate of the value of Methodist instruction has been greatly modified by what I have seen of its fruits, and I am grieved to say, that many a poor slave who is wild with delight, in their revivals, gives most painful evidence, that his religion is unfruitful in his daily life. It is the stony ground seed, which has no root in itself, and speedily withers away. Let me not be understood to lessen the value of religious instruction as imparted to the slaves. Many, very many among them embrace the gospel in sincerity and truth and under the ministry of all evangelical denominations; but how much greater would be this influence, were it not for the vast subtractions, which the compulsory ignorance and debasing influences and bad examples of slavery, will of necessity make, both in the number and character of these supposed conversions.

And in fidelity, I must here add, that many Presbyterian families, professedly pious, take little or no pains for the religious instruction of their slaves. Instances are known, on large plantations, where Presbyterian masters, in full communion with the church, are cruel and remorseless in their treatment of their slaves. Dr. Adams might go to the mansion of the master, and tell us of their piety; but facts have broken through the awful ramparts of slavery, nay through the hedges of pro-slavery Presbyterian churches, which ought to have consigned the guilty oppressor to his grave, while yet that oppressor walks before men in the garb of sanctity, and finds no reproof or complaint from his pro-slavery minister or brethren.

I am aware that our church has enjoined it upon church sessions, to discountenance and prevent all cruelty in the

treatment of slaves; but I am ignorant of any action in this matter, which has to any extent met the requirements or suggestions of the General Assembly. Here and there, a case so flagrant has occurred, that it would be intolerable to pass it over, and censures have been pronounced; but the organic evil protects itself against remedy, by its inherent strength. The mass of the community at the South being infected with it, will overlook its abuses, and they who might wish to prevent cruelty, are themselves prevented by their fear of others, as well as by their own interests.

And now, my dear Sir, are you willing to look your Congregational brethren in the face; will you tell them, in one breath, that you will not pronounce of slavery whether it is right or wrong? In your next, will you defend it from the Bible? In the next, will you speak of it as a great evil, and boast that you have done much to remove it? And now what will you do next? With the conflicting and ever varying views of slavery, which mark your pages, how will you conduct the argument? With no stand-point, but the shifting, and I may add shiftless positions to which you are alternately driven, in what direction will you apply your reasonings? To a mind like yours, accustomed to direct and systematic argument, the struggle is great indeed. Among the shallows and quicksands of slavery you are tossed about, like a ship without compass or rudder. The defect is not in your mind, but in your subject. Your Congregational brethren look upon your struggles in the net of slavery, as of one whose strength, great as it is, is overtasked by the green withs and the new cords, which are thrown around you, as you grapple in the unequal conflict. Struggle on a little longer, and when the strife of intellect is over, the warm love of that gospel, which burns in your heart, will teach you the wrong of the slave, and enlist your talents in a cause worthy their noblest exercise.

In your closing letter, you refer to the number of free colored people in the slaveholding States, and you account for the large proportion of such, by voluntary emancipation in the Southern States. If your conclusion is correct, it is in-

deed a most encouraging sign of progress in the Southern conscience. It proves that truth is rapidly penetrating the minds of our brethren, and is an evidence that conscience is often stronger than mere pecuniary interest. I confess myself highly gratified with the statement, and though I account for a part of it, by the natural increase of the free population, yet your conclusion is not in the main unwarrantable. And in this connection, I would hope that our own church has been instrumental in this great result. I believe her noble principles of religious liberty will force their way over civil restraints which are not warranted by the Bible.

But in the midst of this cheering view, we are met by the startling fact, that slaves have multiplied in far greater proportion. This is a statement not to be disputed, and it calls upon us now, both in Church and State, to arrest the tremendous evil. It is your opinion, that abolitionists have done little towards hastening the freedom of the slave; but the flood of light they have poured upon the Southern mind, is beginning to shew itself in most encouraging forms. Republican meetings are held in Virginia; nay these principles are seconded by warm applause, and the Virginians now see the mighty tide of immigrants, which but for slavery would fill the Old Dominion with beauty and riches and honor, passing far to the West, without casting one "longing, lingering look behind." In Kentucky the voice of freedom is heralding the progress of nobler principles, and the glad hope of the extinction of slavery, is animating thousands of hearts, and finds utterance in many voices. Yes Sir, these principles of abolition, hated and despised as they may be, are yet honored and cherished in many a Southern heart, which as yet dares not give them expression. All the mighty interests of the nation are dwindling into insignificance by the side of this great Question, which is now divested of all compromise and trick and art, and stands naked before the nation, demanding its tremendous solution. Slavery has overreached herself. She silenced the Southern press and the Southern church. She appealed to the cupidity of the North, and obtained the hated Fugitive Slave Law. And

here her conquests end. She has reached the zenith of her power, and to-day the shades are lengthening on the circle of her dial. God and man are united for her overthrow. Her monstrous assumptions, her unmitigated absurdities, her lying pretensions, are seen in a sunlight which knows no setting. The church is cutting loose from the fangs of this deadly serpent. Every minister of Christ, who loves his God, his Bible, his race, or his own character, will cast off from its fatal embrace. God grant, my dear Sir, that your next endeavor may be in behalf of the oppressed, and when your setting sun shall be darkened in the shades of death, may your dying eye be illumined by visions of that free, happy land, "Where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest."

Most sincerely yours,

SMECTYMNUUS.

# LETTER TO REV. NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D.

---

Rev. and dear Sir,—

I have seen many books and pamphlets which may justly be termed *Pleas for the Slave*, but never, till I read your book entitled "A South Side View of Slavery," did I see one that so well deserved the title, "*A Plea for Slavery.*" I have read Dr. Thornwell, Dr. Rice, and other Southern ministers, who have softened the aspect of this evil, as much as possible, but I have never seen or heard of a writer before, who discovered so much of the utility and so many of the blessings of slavery, as have been displayed in your book. Indeed, you have presented us with scenes so pleasant and attractive, that we would fain linger on this enchanted ground, and feel its refreshing breezes, and cull its beautiful amaranths, that we may be strengthened to encounter the sad realities of slavery, when the lovely, but illusive visions are dispelled. Indeed you have done what you could, unconsciously I would hope, to rivet the fetters of the slave—to hush the misplaced philanthropy which would restore to him his rights, and invest him with the ornaments and dignities of a moral and immortal being. You would leave his destiny in the hands of his absolute master. No idea that he is wronged must enter his mind; he must have no knowledge of his rights, no permission, or ability to study the word of God; no interest but his master's; no desire, or endeavor to escape from bondage. He must be contented and submissive, though deprived of those blessings *which to*

*you are dearer than life*, and to which, his right is as *good as yours.* Even the cruelties of slavery are imaginary—a sale at the auction-block, so terrible to sensitive nerves, is a blessing in disguise. Indeed the compensations of slavery are such, that all abstract notions of right and wrong must be exploded. "You cannot but look at the South as the appointed protector of this feeble member of the human family," and "such have been the marvellous acts of divine grace to the Africans, that it requires neither strong faith, nor fancy, to suppose that this work might still go on, *in the form of interchange of the blacks between Africa and the Southern States*," and "as sure as Christ is to reign through the earth, the Christians at the South will vindicate themselves as the benefactors of the colored race." "While we are sure to hear of distressing cruelties, ten thousand acts of kindness are not mentioned." "Religion in the masters destroys every thing in slavery, which makes it obnoxious, and converts the relation of the slave into an effectual means of happiness."

And the Bible, too, is the friend of slavery. That holy Book, which declares "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," "teaches clearly that the relation is not sinful," and "slavery itself is no where assailed," in its sacred pages. Paul did not act with the maxim, that "the apostles girdled slavery and left it to die," "he did not quietly pass his axe round the sins of his day," and yet "slavery is no where assailed." "Was he therefore a pro-slavery man. Not he. Would he have spoken against the system of American slavery had he lived in our day? Surely he would against its evils and abuses and sins, *but not against the relation of master and slave.*"*

Is this sketch of your book, dear Sir, in any-wise untrue? Have you not made discoveries of righteousness and goodness in slavery, till now unattained, by the keenest optics of Northern or Southern men? You have celebrated these blessings in a book whose second and third editions testify

* These quotations are from the "South Side View."

the value of your contributions to the cause of slavery. You have ascended to heights in the stupendous illusions of slavery, which the eagle wings of Thornwell and Rice have never explored. Its blessings are immortal—its evils and abuses almost too insignificant to be named.

It would seem impossible that any one could expect that such a book should be refuted by sober argument. A deformity so monstrous, issuing from a pen, whose delightful utterances on the divine themes of christian faith and hope, have cheered many a desponding heart, is a contrast so sad, that we would gladly treat it as the dream of the maniac; but your character and your position, require us to deal with you as a man, sober and intelligent, miserably deluded it may be, yet still responsible and sincere.

I therefore take from your book the following positions, by which you seek to justify slavery; and the whole drift of your statements, your arguments and your personal observation go to sustain them.

1st. American slavery, as a whole, is a system of blessings to the African race.

2d. The relation of master and slave, as it exists in this country or elsewhere, is in no wise sinful, though abuses and sins and those of an aggravated character may grow out of it.

3d. The Bible sustains the system of slavery, and the doctrine of the right of property in man, is distinctly revealed.

4th. American slavery is practically the mildest form of involuntary servitude, though it has as rigid a code as any; and this is owing to the kind influences of the gospel, which in religious men destroys every thing in slavery which is obnoxious.

I have placed these points nearly in the order in which they appear in your book.

First. Slavery, on the whole, is a system of blessings to the African race.

And what if it be so? Does this justify the accursed system? Does it vindicate the slaveholder, that some inci-

dental blessings are mingled in the bitter cup of the slave. The fires of Smithfield were of eminent service to the cause of Christ, but does this obliterate one line of that damning guilt which rests upon the memory of Bishops Gardiner and Bonner and their bigoted mistress, Queen Mary? Not at all. No more do the blessings of the gospel, which are found by the slave, redeem his master from the villany of robbing that slave of his civil and social rights, and appropriating his labor to his own benefit. Your position has nothing to do with the moral character of slavery. Let it be proved, and it is nothing to the purpose. Your business is with the system, not as compared with Africa in heathenism, but in relation to the known obligations of justice and equity—and it is to the same standard of obligation to which you hold your fellow men, that I bring the slaveholder for trial and conviction. It is manifest to the most careless observer, that no credit is due to the slaveholder, because God has ordained that good may be realized by the slave in the overrulings of his Providence.

But your position in itself is, after all, more than doubtful. Christianity would of course penetrate Africa, more or less, through missionary operations, and it would go unfettered by the shameful clogs which slavery has thrown around it. It would gain a striking advantage by this freedom, and be a blessing indeed to that hapless race, who are now the victims of oppression. Neither have you estimated the loss which slavery inflicts on Christianity—the hindrances to missions, the infidelity, the paralysis of effort, which have grown out of it, and which retards the conversion of Africa. How much does the slave-holding South do for African missions? The Southern churches well know, that if the light of the gospel, unfettered by slavery, should penetrate Africa, it would strike a fatal blow at the institution, and put its nameless curses out of the catalogue of blessings.

But there is another view of these peculiar blessings of slavery. One fourth of the slaves embarked for America have perished in the horrors of the middle passage—the remainder have been consigned to bondage, and are now per-

petuating and multiplying a race of slaves. Had they remained in Africa in a savage state, it is manifest that the population would have been restricted nearly to the limits it has had for ages—so that slavery has consigned millions to bondage and wretchedness, who but for this, would never have cursed the day of their birth. What though it be Providential, as every thing is in this world, even to our smallest affairs? This is not the light in which we are to read our duty. The hieroglyphics of Providence are to be decyphered only by faith and God's word. The mighty overrulings of God stand infinitely above the obligations and duties of men. To all human appearance, the advocacy of slavery dooms the African race to everlasting bondage; it invites and encourages the slave traffic; and yet God may order it otherwise, and the richest blessings may come from the most abominable crimes. But man shall be judged by his own acts, and not by the good or ill results which may spring from them.

But your second position declares that the relation of master and slave is in no wise sinful, though abuses and sins, and those of an aggravated character, may grow out of it.

Here you separate the tree and its fruit. The tree is good, but the fruit may or may not be good. Men may gather grapes or thorns from the same tree; it needs no engrafting of piety, for it is good in itself; yet it may be improved by this process, for "Religion," you tell us, "destroys every thing in slavery which is obnoxious." Your position is simply absurd, and it needs no argument to make this fact obvious to your readers.

But I will not detain you, or my readers, on this point. I come at once to the sins and abuses, which you say may grow out of the system. I ask you, then, what these abuses are? Is it an *abuse* of slavery, to rob a man of his liberty, his time, his labor, his opportunities of improvement, his social and domestic rights, the privilege of reading the Bible, and other blessings, which he loses by his condition of bondage? These surely are no abuses—they are the *very thing*, *slavery itself*. Take them away, and bondage ceases. You will not contend that the mass of the best slaveholders con-

sider these things as abuses. They are the necessary incidents of slavery; and if these are right, the system is right—if these are wrong, slavery is wrong. Now, dear Sir, are you deluded by the miserable fallacy, that slavery is *right*, and its *necessary accompaniments are wrong*? It has no existence without these appendages. What distinctions will the sharpest discrimination make here? What microscopic enchantment has presented to you, in sensible lines, that which is indivisible? If you assert of these deprivations, that they are just, then slavery is just, for it cannot exist a moment without them; if you admit they are wrong, then slavery is wrong, for these are the things that make the system of bondage—without them, it is but a shadow, nay an absolute nonentity.

But let us examine its abuses. 1st. The use of the lash. I suppose you would limit this abuse—possibly you may think it a necessary and healthful discipline; it is only an abuse perhaps, when it becomes violent and cruel, and then you will say it is sinful. But let me tell you that every stroke of the whip upon the hapless slave, is cruelty and injustice, for his is a *compulsory* service—he has a right to decline it, but he dares not. That which is wrong in the outset, becomes doubly wrong, when enforced by violence. Do I need to tell you, that in families reputed pious, large benefactors to religious societies and high in religious profession, the lash is not only essential to the field slave, but is freely used in these families, and is deemed a necessary article of kitchen furniture? Such is the literal fact. Yes, in these households of prayer, households to question whose piety, would be, in your view, the extreme of bigotry, this fact is not only seen, but when the slaves are sullen or supposed to be so, they are often forced into a position, which may yield some pretence for severe punishment, that the evil spirit may be expelled, and the other slaves preserved from the contagion. But I forget myself. "Religion in the masters destroys every thing in slavery which is obnoxious, and not only so, it converts the relation of the slave into an effectual means of happiness."

But let us look at its harsher abuses. We will take, secondly, the auction-block. When I reached this point in your

"South Side View," I began to expect some fairness in your statements—some condemnation proportioned to the outrage committed upon human rights; but I was out of measure astonished to find what a rich blessing was contained in this seeming cruelty. What an unspeakable relief must it give to a generous heart, to think that the 183 slaves belonging to the estate of a deceased slaveholder, who were recently sold at auction for more than $100,000, were probably receiving a rich blessing. Away with that false philanthropy which imagines any evil in the moderate use of the whip, or the necessary and useful separations of the slaves. No matter what cries and tears and woes cluster round the desolate negro, he will soon find the rich blessings of his new condition; his sufferings are a delusion, nay a positive blessing.

A few years ago, a Northern gentleman ascended James River on his way to Richmond. On board the steamer was a company of slaves, bound for the Richmond market. Among the rest was a mother and her eight children. You will not sell this family separately, said he to the overseer. Oh no, was the reply, we shall provide against that. The conversation here dropped. A few days after, this same gentleman stepped into the slave-market at Richmond, from motives of curiosity. An auction had just been held, and the purchasers were removing their slaves. On a lowly bench sat the broken-hearted and despairing mother; her eight children had been sold, and the awful and eternal separation had been made—helpless and disconsolate, moveless as a statue, the picture of despair—she presented an image of unutterable woe, which left its indelible features on the mind of the beholder. But I forget myself again. These are blessings in disguise—happy mother!! blessed orphans!! you are rich sharers in the gifts and blessings of slavery.

I have said little or nothing of the slave-dealer. In your view, I see not how he can be guilty of crime, for buying and selling, so far as your observation went, was a blessing. If slavery is fruitful of good, he is the agent (not criminal surely) of its diffusion. He may take rich comfort from your view of the auction-block—it is a precious opiate to his conscience—

you have guided him to sources of consolation in his infamous traffic, of which perhaps he never dreamed. But I must pause. My heart sickens, as my eye goes over those pages, which were penned by the hand of one, whose sacred office is to bind up the broken hearted, to be a refuge for the oppressed and a shield for the defenceless. Surely, dear Sir, you have not threaded the labyrinths and mysteries of slavery—into its dark depths, hidden from human observation, your eye has not penetrated—had it been so, your book would have never seen the light.

Your third position is that the Bible sustains the system of slavery, and in it the doctrine of the right of property in man is distinctly revealed. In this statement all the declarations of God against injustice, fraud, oppression, and robbery of the poor, are in your view of no force against slavery. You hold that its permission, under certain circumstances, make it warrantable and justfiable now. You believe, with Dr. Rice, that the Bible condemns all these iniquities, but tolerates slavery. You imagine that because Paul did not condemn slavery itself, while he condemned every thing that belongs to it, he was tolerant of the system. As well might you plead, that because he did not condemn the barbarous sports of the Roman theatre, it was lawful for Christians to amuse themselves in this way. Paul was not ignorant that the gospel was pointed against all iniquity, and there were multitudes of sins which were *not* specially condemned by him, which were so obviously wrong, that no precept was necessary respecting them. So of slavery—*every one* of its accompaniments he condemned in most positive terms, and the thing itself disappears when these are gone. Did he then justify or tolerate slavery? As well might you say it was lawful for the Christian to worship in the temples of Venus and Apollo, because there was no express prohibition of these divinities. The idolatry forbidden by the Bible, was not more truly *inherent* in the worship of these false gods, than the injustice and fraud forbidden in the Scriptures are *inherent* in slavery.

I might here ask you a question, which is not only pertinent, but may be used as a test for the trial of your position.

Has the slave a right to leave his master? Will he commit a sin, if, believing his master has no righteous claim for unrewarded services, he escapes from bondage to a land of freedom? Will you condemn his flight? He comes to your door and asks shelter from the officers of the law; will you give it to him?—or will you restore him to the blessings of slavery, and tell him he has no right to escape; that he is in better condition at home, and that the Bible tells him to obey his master and not escape from him. Perhaps the suppliant at your door is a feeble member of the body of Christ. What will you do with her? I can answer for you. The "South Side View" will vanish; the truth will shine upon you; human laws will not bar your door; the higher law will step in, and assert its claims, and you will give shelter and comfort to the outcast. But if true to the principles you have laid down, you will deliver the fugitive to the officer, and the officer will send her back to bondage, if indeed, she does not choose death, rather than life.

But I have already in my letters to Dr. Rice dwelt sufficiently on this argument. You may wrest the Scriptures and pervert them to the most unhallowed purposes—but the eternal finger of inspiration is fixedly pointed at every form of slavery. He who finds the approval of slavery in the Bible, found it first in his own heart, and was thus blinded by the deceitfulness of sin.

But, in the last place, you tell us that American slavery is practically the mildest form of involuntary servitude, and this is owing to the kind infusions of the gospel, which in "religious men destroys every thing in slavery which is obnoxious."

It is probably true that the religious element in America has to some extent softened the aspects of slavery. But the wonder is that the Protestant religion of America, should have gained so slight a victory over the atrocities of papal nations. England and France have wiped the stain from their garments. Protestant England and Papal France. Yet it is a fact, that France, in the darkness of the Papacy, has discovered and performed her duty, while Protestant America in this point is involved in more than Papal darkness. The

signs of the times indicate that it will soon disappear from Catholic countries, while Protestant ministers and a Protestant Church, will be its only advocates in the civilized world.

But you add a sentence, I have often quoted, and it is this, "Religion in men destroys every thing in slavery which is obnoxious." Charity might hope that this was a careless and unconsidered expression, for surely its truth is impossible. Religion is slow in its victories over human prejudice and passion—it exists in hearts very imperfectly sanctified, and you claim for it a triumph which it has never achieved. In man's imperfect condition, this complete victory is impossible. Religion, in individual cases, has abolished slavery, confessed its enormity, and repaired its evils, as far as possible. But this degree of light has reached but few minds. Such is the force of habit, the love of property, the desire for influence and authority, that the views of numbers, who it might be hoped are in the main Christians, are too much clouded to perceive the injustice and wrong of slavery. It is our aim to diffuse the light of truth—to dispel these clouds, to enlighten the conscience, and vindicate the great principles of the Bible from unholy perversion. Religion will eventually destroy slavery, but it will not destroy all its evils while it exists—to do this, is to destroy the system itself. In this passage you have virtually declared that the slave-owner cannot be a Christian, for if religion in the master destroys all that is obnoxious in slavery, I know of no master who can by *any possibility* be a Christian.

And now, Sir, I turn from the positions you have taken to yourself. Is it too much to say you have strengthened the hands of the oppressor; you have gladdened the hearts of slaveholders; you have consoled the slave-dealer in his dreadful traffic; you have discouraged the efforts of anti-slavery men; you have saddened the heart of many a disciple of Christ; you have burdened their charity with a load, which is scarcely to be borne. We have seen in your devotional works, the most delightful illustrations of gospel truth, and we have lingered long over those sacred themes, which you have addressed with inimitable power to the heart; but

in the book we are considering, the beauty has faded and the glory has departed—the broken harmony of faith and practice, has come upon our ears with discordant and melancholy sound. The chilling winds have withered the flowers of paradise—you have tainted its celestial air, and we turn from the wasted and saddened scene, with weary minds and sickened hearts. Could you but know the strong revulsion which the antagonism of your books has created, you would wonder at your own delusions, as you now wonder at the supposed delusions of others. You have, in the matter before us, a high standard of christian doctrine, and a very low view of christian obligation.

I gladly subscribe to your views of religious truth—they are, in my view, the glory of the gospel. On a Saviour's atoning blood and perfect righteousness, we together rest our hopes for Time and Eternity. But widely divergent are our views of christian duty. Love to man is one of the best evidences of love to God. The christian system is divinely benevolent; it cannot veil in organic forms, the "exceeding sinfulness of sin." Did I not suppose, that the views of slavery you avow, are the effect of a STUPENDOUS DELUSION, my charity and my hope for you would sink together. But I remember the persecutions of Calvin, the mistakes of Luther, the errors of Fenelon, the contentions of Baxter and Owen, and I am satisfied that religion will no more conquer all the corruptions of the heart, than it will "destroy all that is obnoxious in slavery."

But a brighter day is dawning. The christian heart beats with new love to the down-trodden slave. The power of conscience is deeply felt in the public mind. The sin of slavery is forcing itself on the public eye. The church may lag behind, but the work will go on. Your book may stand in the way, but it will be like chaff before the wind. The brazen front of slavery is quailing before the mighty onset of truth. The millennial morning of Africa, comes on with the advancing glories of the Cross. For wise reasons, unknown to us, God has permitted this darkness, in regard to slavery, to settle down for ages upon the nations; but its sophistries

and delusions are fast passing away. He will use even your book to assist in the mighty work. It has done much to reveal the fallacies of slavery; it has stepped over the lines of policy, and its distorted and startling defence of injustice and violence, has led many to ask the character of that system, which requires such auxiliaries. But these blessings of your "South Side View," will no more vindicate *you* for writing it, than the incidental blessings of slavery will justify the *slave-dealer* in his dreadful traffic.

It was the misfortune of the late Mr. Webster, that he was not accessible to the truth. The sycophants who surrounded him, assured him of success in his ambitious views. It was his gross mistake, to view them as the representatives of public sentiment. Their voice to him was the voice of the nation. Southern influence was invoked in his behalf. The Constitution was interpreted for the Slave interest. The South was assured that its interests would be protected. Mr. Webster believed the South would be grateful—the North he imagined was already his own. The dream was suddenly broken, and with it the heart of the great statesman. The mortal eclipse of death passed over him, and his last public acts have stained forever the glory of his life. I say to you, Sir, be not deceived. The flatteries of the South are more fatal than the bite of a serpent; the approbation of partial friends and the silence of those who are aggrieved, do not represent the public estimate of your book. It has weakened your influence to an extent of which you have little conception. Many a heart has mourned for you and for the church which till now has been blessed by your labors. It is not too late to redeem yourself and your many virtues from the withering blight, which must otherwise attend you through life. The shadows of the evening will soon gather around you. Oh let not a life of eminent usefulness go down under this sad eclipse. Solemnly review what you have done, and may the grace of God help you to undo it, before it is too late.

Most sincerely yours,

SMECTYMNUUS.

# PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

# STATE STREET CHURCH,

WITH THE

# RESULT

OF AN

# ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCIL,

AND THE

# VOTE OF THE CHURCH,

AND THE REASONS THEREFOR.

PORTLAND:

PRINTED BY STAPLES & LUNT.

1856.

# PROCEEDINGS, &C.

---

PORTLAND, Oct. 29, 1855.

*To the State Street Congregational Church in Portland.*

DEAR BRETHREN:—The undersigned, members of this Church, humbly trusting in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and being moved, as we pray and believe, to labor for the peace and prosperity of Zion in this city, do unite together in a respectful request to be dismissed from the communion of this Church for the purpose of uniting in the organization of a new Congregational Church to be located in some needy portion of our large and growing city, for the spread of the Gospel of our Redeemer and the ingathering souls into His Kingdom.

Witness our signatures under our own hands.

(Signed,)

MANTHANO PICKERING,
RHODA D. PICKERING,
CHARLES TROWBRIDGE,
SARAH TROWBRIDGE,
ANN H. TROWBRIDGE,
WM. CHASE,
ELLEN A. CHASE,
MARY L. HAMILTON,
AMELIA L. HAMILTON,
E. P. CHASE,
JOHN E. DOW, JR.
JOHN W. MUNGER,
EMELINE S. MUNGER,
HENRY P. DEANE,
ANNIE T. DEANE,
SOPHIA F. MORSE,
THOMAS F. TOLMAN,
AUGUSTA M. TOLMAN,
SUSAN CHASE,
SARAH M. CHASE,
M. CORNELIA D. DOW,
LOUISA D. DOW.

*Voted*, That a Committee be appointed to communicate with parties to the above request and report at a subsequent meeting.

*Voted*, That Ether Shepley, J. A. Balkam, J. T. Dana, John C. Brooks, and J. H. Hamlin, constitute said Committee.

---

Portland, October 31, 1855.

*Dear Brethren and Sisters of the State Street Church:*

The undersigned were appointed a committee of the Church upon your letter of the 29th inst. to inquire into the circumstances occasioning that letter, so far as it may be necessary to do so, to enable the Church to discharge its duty properly and in a spirit with which it should be discharged.

The aspect which you now present and which you propose in future to present, may be noticed, as it may affect the christian intercourse of this and other churches of our denomination with the Church proposed to be organized, thereby affecting the christian fellowship, peace, and prosperity, of the cause of our Lord, especially in this city; and as it respects yourselves and other members of the Church and its Pastor as individuals in their christian intercourse as the servants of our Lord.

If this Church by a dismission of a portion of its members to form a new Church should knowingly assist to organize another Church in this city, which could not be expected to maintain the usual christian intercourse and fellowship with it and with the other sister churches, it might justly be charged with doing wrong by assisting to produce such conditions and relations, as would necessarily operate to break up such fellowship and to introduce division, if not strife among them, thereby injuring instead of promoting the cause of our common Lord.

Hitherto when the condition of a town or city of the size of Portland and of the churches within it has been found or believed to be, such as to make it desirable, that another church of our denomination should be formed, it has been usual to have a free and open consultation of all the members of the church or

churches, from which the members to compose the new church were to be taken.

This mode of proceeding does not appear to have been adopted in your case—so far as information has been received no attempt of the kind has been made, and this church, from which all the members to compose a new church is proposed to be taken (so far as it has been informed) has not in any way been consulted.

It may be and probably is true, that new churches have been formed in such places in a different manner by division and strife amongst the members of a church injurious to christian character and fellowship and to the prosperity of true piety and religion, thus bringing dishonor upon the Saviour's cause.

The course of proceeding and the language used by some of your number, and the establishment of separate religious worship without any church connected with it and without any consultation with your fellow members acting as a church respecting the propriety of so doing, seems rather to present the aspect of a proposed organization of a church in the mode last named.

This church therefore desires, before acting definitively upon your application, to be informed, whether such apparent aspect should be regarded as the true and real one; and if it should not be, how is it to be explained, that such an apparent aspect and position is presented.

With respect to your position as individuals there is believed to be a difference. In this respect some of you, so far as our information extends, should be regarded as having maintained their christian intercourse with other members of the Church and with its Pastor worthily. Others may have been dissatisfied without making any unsuitable exhibition or expression of it; while some of your number have made such a public exhibition of their dissatisfaction and have made declarations, as we are credibly informed, that they had no confidence in the Pastor, as to authorize an inference, that he did not possess a moral or a christian character fitting him to be a worthy minister of our Lord.

Now, if you have any such knowledge, it is esteemed to

be your duty to other members of the Church, who have no such knowledge or belief, to state it, before your connexion with us is dissolved, so clearly and definitely, that the truth of any such allegations may be fully investigated; or if you have no such knowledge, that you with equal plainness state it; that all such inferences may be shown to be without the least foundation.

It is not perceived that you can, without it, be considered as having kept your covenant with the Church, that you would in all things seek "its peace and welfare."

We are desired by our Pastor to inform you, that the am plest opportunity that you can desire, will be afforded for the fullest and most extensive investigation of his private character and ministerial conduct.

To prevent any misunderstandings respecting our inquiries and communications, as well as to afford you and us opportunity for a more deliberate and prayerful consideration of them, we address you in writing, and will thank you to communicate with us in like manner for the same purposes, and that we may not be left to commit any error in presenting your sentiments to the Church.

Your brethren in Christ,

(Signed,) Ether Shepley,
John A. Balkam,
John C. Brooks,
J. H. Hamlin,
Israel T. Dana,
} Com. of State St. Church.

To Manthano Pickering and other subscribers to the letter of 29th October inst.

---

Portland, Nov. 15, 1855.

*To the Committee of the State Street Church:*

Dear Brethren: — Your official letter addressed to "Manthano Pickering and twenty one others, members of State Street Church," was duly received and has been submitted for perusal to the persons interested in it.

We desire to express to the Church our appreciation of the kindly feeling and christian courtesy, which they have manifested towards us in the appointment of the Committee, whose letter is now before us, and also to express our thanks to the Committee for the christian and friendly interest in us which is the burden of their letter.

In reply to the letter we beg leave to say in all christian candor and kindness, that while different reasons may move different persons in the same direction, we do not feel ourselves called upon to depart from the customs observed in application, for dismission and recommendation from christian fellowship, to define reasons for such application or even to intimate that we had any reasons, other than those, which are involved in the statement of the object we have in view in requesting our dismission.

The object we have in view is to unite together (with others) in the organization, under the blessing of God, of a new Orthodox Congregational Church, to be located in some one of the needy portions of our large and growing city, and to labor together in building up the Church, in the spread of the Gospel and the conversion of sinners.

And with this object in view we feel that we have the approval and blessing of the Great Head of the Church, and we beg leave further to state, that we are conscious of an earnest desire to live peaceably with all men, if it be possible, as much as lieth in us, and we shall also earnestly pray and hope and labor in all things for the communion of christians and the fellowship of the Churches throughout the city of our own denomination and also of the whole Evangelical Church.

We would, therefore, again respectfully ask through the Committee, to be dismissed from the communion of the State Street Church, for the object stated in our letter to the Church of the 29th ult.

And may the blessing of God be with you all,—Amen.

(Signed,) MANTHANO PICKERING,

*and twenty-one others.*

The Committee of the State Street Church to whom the answer of the Brethren and Sister sasking a dismission was referred, ask leave to

## REPORT.

That by the communication made to them their attention was particularly called to two subjects. The first had reference to the position, which the Church proposed to be organized might be expected to present in its christian intercourse with this and other sister Churches of our denomination. The answer respecting this matter is regarded as satisfactory. It does not indeed explain, why appearances had been presented rendering such an inquiry necessary; but this is not regarded as a matter of importance.

The other subject of inquiry had reference to their individual conduct and declarations. They were in substance informed that some of their number had by their conduct and declarations authorized inferences unfavorable to the character of our Pastor as a Minister of our Lord; and they were desired, if they had any knowledge authorizing such inferences to state it, and if they had not, to state it; that the truth might be ascertained, and such inferences shown to be without foundation.

They were also informed, that it was not perceived how they could be regarded as having kept their covenant obligations without doing so. To this part of that communication they made no answer whatever; unless the following observations can be so regarded:

They observed, "We do not feel ourselves called upon to depart from the customs observed in application for dismission and recommendation from christian fellowship to define reasons for such application, or even to intimate, that we have any reasons other than those, which are involved in the statement of the object we have in view in requesting our dismission." If this be considered as having reference to those inquiries, it would seem to amount to a refusal to answer them. The inquiry is then presented, whether the Church can properly discharge its duty and grant their request without obtaining any answer to such inquiries and without any explanation of such conduct or

declarations, and without any disavowal of the inference, that might be drawn from them.

Your Committee on reflection cannot come to any other conclusion than this:—That it is the right and solemn duty of the Church to require some such statement, explanation, or disavowal, before they are dismissed, as will enable the Church to ascertain the truth or to show that such inferences would be destitute of the least foundation in truth. If it were not so, it would be justly chargeable with a desire to sustain a Pastor, whatever his character might be, or at least with indifference respecting his private and ministerial character. Our Pastor is also justly entitled to have all unfavorable imputations or inferences withdrawn or disclaimed or their truth investigated, especially when they have been occasioned by members of his Church.

Your Committee therefore present for your consideration the following Resolution.

*Resolved*, That the answer of the Brethren and Sisters of this Church, bearing date November 15, 1855, to a letter addressed to them making inquiry respecting certain matters therein stated, is not satisfactory; and that the Clerk be requested to furnish them with a copy of this report and resolution.

(Signed,) ETHER SHEPLEY,
Per Order.

Nov. 28, 1855.

---

ADJOURNED MEETING, Wed. Eve., Nov. 28.

Dea. OXNARD in the Chair.

*Voted*, That the Report of the Committee in the case of M. Pickering and others be accepted.

*Voted*, That the Resolution contained in the above report be adopted.

---

PORTLAND, Dec. 1, 1855.

*To the State Street Congregational Church in Portland.*

DEAR BRETHREN:—The undersigned, having had transmitted to them, by your scribe, an attested copy of the Records of a Church meeting held on the evening of the 28th ult., con-

taining the report of your Committee appointed to communicate with the undersigned concerning their application for dismission and recommendation from the Church; would respectfully represent that they have carefully considered the communication, and do affectionately and prayerfully submit to the Church the following:

We have endeavored in the spirit of Christian love, and with humble trust in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to examine the communication addressed to us by your Committee, and also the reply of the undersigned thereto, both of which have been presented to the Church by the Committee, and we are compelled to the conclusion, that we have fairly considered and answered the address of the Committee, as far as lay in our power and to the best of our judgment, and we deeply regret that the reply should have been deemed unsatisfactory, as appeared from the resolution appended to the Committee's Report and by you adopted.

We have already stated in our reply to the Committee, that we did not feel called upon to depart from the customs observed in application for letters of dismission and recommendation, to define our reasons, or even to intimate that we had any reasons other than those involved in the statement of the object we had in view in making our request.

In making this statement we wish to be understood as having acted under the promptings of our best christian judgment and conscience, having in view as we humbly believe, the best interests of all concerned, and the peace and prosperity of the Church of the Redeemer.

And should the Church still deem our reply as unsatisfactory and still withhold from us our request for dismission and recommendation from the Church; then—however much and painfully we regret it—we would, and hereby do affectionately invite the Church to unite with us in calling a council of Ministers and Churches, before which shall be laid the request of the undersigned, and the matters thereto pertaining, mutually agreeing to abide its decision in the case.

And should the Church decline to unite with us in calling the Council, then the undersigned will feel constrained to call a Council Ex-parte for advice and decision.

And as any further unnecessary delay in the premises

cannot but be growingly afflicting to all the persons and interests involved, we would respectfully ask that an answer be communicated to us on or before Wednesday the 5th of December. If by that time no answer is received, then the undersigned will proceed to call the Council Ex-parte, to be convened in Union Hall, Portland, on Wednesday, 19th of December, at 11 o'clock, A. M.

In calling the Council, mutual or Ex-parte, as the case may be, the undersigned will be properly represented by the following Committee, with which, if the Council be mutual, a similar Committee appointed by you will confer.

MANTHANO PICKERING,
WM. CHASE,
HENRY P. DEANE,
} Committee.

For a mutual Council, we, on our part, propose to send letters missive to the following Churches and Pastors.

Second Parish Church, in Portland,—Rev. J. J. Carruthers, D. D., Pastor.

Third Parish Church, Portland,—Rev. W. T. Dwight, D. D., Pastor.

High Street Church, Portland,—Rev. J. W. Chickering, D. D., Pastor.

Church in Gorham, Me.,—Rev. John R. Adams, Pastor.

Should the Council be called Ex-parte, then we will add to the above named Churches and Pastors as may seem proper to us.

Finally, brethren, we desire and pray for peace with all men, and especially with the Church of the Saviour, of which we claim to be members, however unworthy of so great a distinction we may be; and for this peace and the universal prosperity of Zion we shall ever labor and hope and beseech.

Your brethren in Christ,

(Signed,) MANTHANO PICKERING,
*and twenty-one others.*

---

SPECIAL MEETING OF STATE STREET CHURCH.

IN THE VESTRY,
Monday Evening, Dec. 3, 1855.

Dea. OXNARD in the Chair.

A communication was read from M. PICKERING and others; whereupon it was voted—

1. To accede to the request of the brethren and sisters for the call of a mutual Council, to be assembled at the time and place by them proposed.

2. To concur in their proposal to send letters missive to the Churches and Pastors by them designated, and to accept them without any addition to their number by this Church, as composing the Council.

3. That ETHER SHEPLEY, J. A. BALKAM, and I. T. DANA, be a Cammittee to represent this Church in that Council, and to perform all acts necessary for the accomplishment of the desired purpose.

4. That the Scribe be requested to furnish a copy of these votes to the brethren and sisters who have made the request.

Agreeably to letters missive a Mutual Ecclesiastical Council was convened at Union Hall, Portland, on Wednesday, December 26, 1855, at 11 o'clock, A. M. The following persons were present as members of the Council.

Rev. WM. T. DWIGHT, D. D., 3d. Parish Church, Portland. Dea. EDWARD GOULD, Delegate.

Rev. J. J. CARRUTHERS, D. D., 2d. Parish Church, Portland. Dea. S. W. LARRABEE, Delegate.

Rev. J. W. CHICKERING, D. D., High Street Church, Portland. Brc. ALBION K. PARRIS, Delegate.

Rev. J. R. ADAMS, Church, Gorham. Bro. C. A. STACKPOLE, Delegate.

The Council was organized by the choice of Rev. Dr. DWIGHT as Moderator, and Rev. J. R. ADAMS as Scribe.

After prayer by the Moderator, papers were presented stating the object for which the Council was convened. They contained the request of MANTHANO PICKERING and twenty-one others, addressed to the State Street Church for letters of dismission from said Church and recommendation, for the purpose of organizing a new Orthodox Congregational Church in some needy portion of the growing city of Portland. In addition to this request were other papers containing the action of State Street Church and the communications of M. Pickering and others, relating thereto.

Opportunity was then given for verbal explanations, after which the Council voted to be by themselves. Subsequently they adjourned until 2 1-2 o'clock, P. M., and in the afternoon, having met according to adjournment, they adopted unanimously the following Report as the result of Council.

## REPORT.

Although it is in all cases of new church organizations desirable and proper that the parties should act in concurrence with the Churches to which they belong, yet, inasmuch as the State Street Church have virtually withdrawn their objections on this ground, the Council see no reason for action on the subject.

The only remaining ground for the refusal consists of certain allegations said to have been brought against the Pastor of State Street, but inasmuch as no such allegations are made in the documents before the Council by the petitioners and no accusation to this effect is brought against them as a body, the Council can see no reason, why, on account of such allegations, their request should be refused; especially as the State Street Church has not deemed them of sufficient importance to make them the subject of enquiry and discipline; therefore

*Resolved*, As the judgment of the Council, that the request of said M. PICKERING and 21 others should be granted.

*Resolved*, That the Moderator and Scribe be authorized to call a subsequent meeting of the Council, if they deem it expedient.

W. T. DWIGHT, Moderator.
JOHN R. ADAMS, Scribe.

An adjourned meeting was holden in the Vestry, Thursday evening, 27th Dec., 1855.

Dea. OXNARD in the Chair. C. A. LORD, Scribe, pro tem.

Judge SHEPLEY, as Chairman of Committee, made a verbal report of the meeting of the Council and then read the result of Council, which was ordered to be recorded at large.

Reasons for dissent from the result of the Council were then considered and after some discussion, passed nem. con. and ordered to be entered on the Church record.

In accordance with the result of an Ecclesiastical Council now presented which is regarded as erroneous; and as a precedent suited still further to impair the permanency of the pastoral relation and the discipline and harmony of churches;

*Voted*, That MANTHANO PICKERING and the twenty-one other members of this church, who have by their application, bearing date on October 29, 1855, requested it, be dismissed for the purpose therein stated, as members in regular standing, so far as it does not otherwise appear from documents recorded in the records of this church and presented to the Council upon which the responsibility will rest for this compliance with, its result. And when those members shall have been so organized, their relations to this church will cease:

*Voted*, That an attested copy of the above be presented to them by the Scribe.

The result of the Ecclesiastical Council, now presented, is regarded by the church as erroneous, subversive of correct principles in ecclesiastical proceedings, and dangerous as a precedent.

The members, asking a dismission were, in a communication made to them, accused, in substance, of establishing a separate religious worship without any consultation with this church respecting the propriety of so doing, and with uniting to form another church without any such consultation.

The result of Council states, that "the State Street church have virtually withdrawn their objections on this ground."

It is not perceived, that any matter was virtually or otherwise withdrawn, except the inquiry into the character and relations, which the church proposed to be organized, might be expected to sustain.

The result of Council states,that "the only remaining ground of refusal consists of certain allegations said to have been brought against the Pastor of State Street Church."

The propriety of speaking of any ground of "refusal" is not perceived. The documents presented to the Council shew, that there had been no refusal of their request, that the church had not acted upon it further than to make inquiries and to ask for certain statements, explanations, or disavowal of inferences preparatory to final action and decision.

Nor does the only remaining subject appear to have been "certain allegations said to have been brought against the Pastor of State Street Church."

Beside this, there remained the accusation, that "some of your number have made such public exhibition of their dissatisfaction," as combined with their declarations, authorized inferences against the Pastor.

Some of the applicants or petitioners were, in the communication addressed to them on October 31, 1855, accused of having made such a public exhibition of their dissatisfaction, and with having made declarations, that they had no confidence in the Pastor as to authorize inferences, that he did not possess a moral or christian character fitting him to be a worthy minister of our Lord; and they were desired, if they had any such knowledge, to state it, and if they had not, so to state.

In their answer they do not deny, that they had so acted

and spoken, or intimate, that the church was misinformed, or that the accusation was not true.

When a person is deliberately accused of having done wrong and is called upon to deny or admit the facts alleged, and he does not deny the truth of the allegation, or that there is any error in it, the person making the accusation is entitled, according to all known rules of law, morals, and honor, to hold him responsible for such conduct and declarations without further proof.

Under such circumstances, the result of the Council does not censure the conduct of the accused, or require them to state any reasons for such conduct, or to disavow any inferences that might be justly drawn from their conduct and declarations; while it requires the church to dismiss them without it, thereby countenancing, if not encouraging, such a course of conduct.

One reason assigned therefor appears to be, that "no such allegations are made in the documents before the Council by the Petitioners."

The effect of this would seem to be, that the accused might by their conduct and declarations authorize inferences to be made unfavorable to the moral or ministerial character of their Pastor, and because they did not repeat them in their written communications, they are to be considered as blameless, and the church is to be considered as in error for requiring any such explanation or disavowal.

Another reason assigned for the result of Council appears to be, that "no accusation to this effect is brought against them as a body."

Twenty-two members of the church "do unite together" and make their application to be dismissed for the purpose of being organized into a new church. Some of their number, without any designation of them, were accused of the conduct and declarations already stated.

All of them, who were consciously free from the charge, could without difficulty and without reproach, say so. Those, who could not, might make explanations or disavowals, or if they had any knowledge, which could justify their course, they could state it. And because all were not accused as a body is one of the reasons presented, why no censure should be passed and why no one should be required to answer or explain his

conduct or disavow the unfavorable inferences, that might be drawn from it. An especial reason assigned for the result of Council appears to be, that "the State Street church has not deemed them of sufficient importance to make them the subject of inquiry and discipline."

The church did deem them of sufficient importance to make them the subject of "inquiry"; thereby exhibiting great forbearance and offering opportunity for such explanations or disavowals of inferences, as might relieve the church and the accused from further difficulties. This was deemed to be a proper preparatory proceeding to a regular course of filing more formal and specific allegations as the basis of discipline.

The accused appear to have called for a mutual council because they did not choose to answer such preparatory inquiries, and by an assent to it, the case was removed from the action of the church before the church had finally acted upon the request or upon the matters of accusation; and under such circumstances an especial reason assigned for the result, is that church had not commenced any act of discipline.

The State Street church has articles for its government, to which all its members have agreed. In the fourth article the following language is found: "It will also give recommendations and dismissions to any evangelical church if requested in a proper spirit and manner; but all other ways of withdrawing from its communion and care will be deemed irregular and censurable."

A printed pamphlet containing these articles was presented to the Council.

The church is required by the result of Council to dismiss the applicants in violation of this provision without having any opportunity to consider whether the proposed mode and purpose of withdrawing was such as it would approve.

*Voted*, That the foregoing be entered upon the records of this church, as the reasons for its vote dismissing MANTHANO PICKERING and twenty-one others.

*Voted*, That 500 copies of the Result of Council and all the correspondence relating thereto on our records, together with the action of the Church to-night, be published in pamphlet form.

Attest: C. A. LORD, Scribe *pro tem.*

Dr. Tyler on Nat. Ability
Harvey's Letter to Tyler.
Tyler to Harvey.
Harvey's 2d Letter to Tyler.
Case's Letter to Tyler.
Clark's Half Century. Address at Camden.
Letter in Defence of Am. Tract Society.
Am. Antiquarian Society (Proceedings &c.
Spirit Communion (Ferguson)
Levi Nelson's Trials &c.
Review of Ghidden & Notts Tyler of Mankind.
Maine Law Illustrated.
Addresses on an Inebriate Asylum.
On Mission Schools
Swedenborg. not Christianity.
Brickman's Defence &c.
Willard's Remonstrance (Deerfield)
Ives Examination of Remonstrance.
McClure on Conversion of N. Europe.
Blood's Ch. Calender
Letters to Dr. Rice & Dr. Adams (Slavery)
State St. Ch. Portland.